

*National
Conference
on*
PLANNING
.
1940

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF PLANNING OFFICIALS

From the collection of the

j f d
y z n m k
o PreLinger a h
u v q g Library
e
b t s w p c

San Francisco, California
2006

5
CP

12

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
NATIONAL CONFERENCE
ON PLANNING

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
NATIONAL CONFERENCE
ON TRAINING

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

1940



No. 1-336

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PLANNING



PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONFERENCE
HELD AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA
JULY 8-11, 1940



AMERICAN SOCIETY OF PLANNING OFFICIALS
1313 EAST SIXTIETH STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Participating Organizations

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PLANNERS

LAWRENCE V. SHERIDAN, *President*

HAROLD W. LAUTNER, *Executive Secretary*

THE AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ASSOCIATION

FREDERIC A. DELANO, *Chairman of the Board*

HORACE M. ALBRIGHT, *President*

HARLEAN JAMES, *Executive Secretary*

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF PLANNING OFFICIALS

BEN H. KIZER, *President*

WALTER H. BLUCHER, *Executive Director*

THE NATIONAL ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PLANNING ASSOCIATION

GEORGE SOULE, *Chairman*

E. JOHNSTON COIL, *Director*



DIRECTOR OF THE CONFERENCE

WALTER H. BLUCHER

Table of Contents

	PAGE
PLANNING THE USE OF OUR RESOURCES <i>Charles W. Eliot</i>	1
Summary of Discussion	7
PUBLIC EDUCATION FOR PLANNING <i>Frederick Bigger</i>	10
Summary of Discussion	20
COUNTY PLANNING IN CALIFORNIA	24
MIGRATION AND RESETTLEMENT OF THE PEOPLE <i>Carey McWilliams</i>	28
Summary of Discussion	36
HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION <i>Committee Report</i>	42
Summary of Discussion	66
ZONING <i>Hugh R. Pomeroy</i>	70
Summary of Discussion	85
REGIONAL INDUSTRIAL TRENDS AND THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST . . <i>Paul J. Raver</i>	89
Summary of Discussion	102
WHAT IS HAPPENING TO OUR CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICTS? . <i>John R. Fugard</i>	107
Summary of Discussion	111
HIGHWAYS AND PLANNING <i>Harlean James</i>	115
ARCHITECTURAL CONTROL IN AMERICA <i>Charles H. Cheney</i>	125
Summary of Discussion	129
A PROGRAM FOR THE USE OF TAX-ABANDONED LAND . . <i>Harold S. Bутtenheim</i>	133
Summary of Discussion	154
CITY PLANNING AND HOUSING—MAY THEY MEET AGAIN . . <i>Tracy B. Augur</i>	157
Summary of Discussion	165
PLANNING IN A DEMOCRACY <i>Charles E. Merriam</i>	168
Summary of Discussion	180
SAN FRANCISCO AS SEEN FROM NEW YORK <i>Rexford G. Tugwell</i>	182
RESOLUTIONS OF THE CONFERENCE	189

Planning the Use of Our Resources

CHARLES W. ELIOT

Director, National Resources Planning Board

The nation is aroused to the immediate necessity of using and mobilizing our resources for defense. We are all concerned in this cause—as individuals, as business men, as taxpayers in our local communities, as voters in the states where we live, and as patriotic citizens of the nation. To be effective in this cause, we must plan and relate the plans of many groups for varied purposes into a national plan and program.

The first item in a national defense program is a decision on what we are going to defend. Most people find a good enough answer in phrases like “the American Way,” or “no European interference in the Western Hemisphere.” But for the preparation of a plan we need something more. Our country and our times are entering a period of great change. With what has already happened in Europe—and whatever still lies ahead, the world, including this country, is going to be a very different place from what it has been. I, for one, am not interested in trying to defend or perpetuate a dead past. What we have had or have done is not so perfect but that we can do much better. It is the right and opportunity to “do much better” that I think we want to protect,—the chance to work out changes and improvements in the use of our resources in gradual transition, through orderly procedures, and using the democratic process with minimum interference from Europe or Asia.

That is the second item for decision,—what we are preparing to defend ourselves against. The world is too small to allow us to isolate ourselves against all “interference.” We face not only the problem of rearmament in terms of warships, planes and tanks, but also that of rearmament against propaganda. In fact the attacks on our form of government, on our economy and on our ideals have already started. The President says we must “make Democracy work within our borders.” That implies that it has not been working as efficiently and effectively as we think it can and ought to work. To combat the propaganda of the totalitarian Fascists or communists, we must prove that the “Democratic Way” can provide and maintain higher standards of living, jobs for all, security and our political rights and freedom, more surely than any other way.

From the answers to these two questions on what we are going to defend and what we are defending ourselves against, the conclusion follows that planning for defense involves much more than mobilization of materials, machines, and men to meet possible attacks upon this hemisphere by armies or navies of other nations. As the President put it at

Charlottesville (June 10, 1940): "We still insist on the need for vast improvements in our own social and economic life. But that is a component part of national defense itself." Our present task is planning for the conservation, development and organization of our resources in ways "to make Democracy work," to make needed changes in our economy and governments in orderly transition, and to make America impregnable against propaganda and sabotage as well as against bombs and bullets.

This conference is concerned with the role of planning for these purposes. I am speaking of planning as a process—thinking ahead, preparing, picturing objectives, proposing methods, and programming steps. Of course, this planning process can be used for good or evil purposes, the methods proposed may seem to us wise or unwise, and the program may be an orderly well-balanced scheme or ludicrously unbalanced. There have been, and I suppose will be, many plans of which you and I wholly disapprove—the war plans which have called for ruthless violations of the little neutrals, "strafing" refugees in Flanders, the regimentation or destruction of liberty and opportunity. These are evidences of the planning process which we hope and believe we can avoid.

The fact that plans like those are loose in the world makes it the more imperative that we in America should make our own plans—preventive plans and development plans.

Our best hope lies in positive planning. In emphasizing positive planning, I do not want to minimize the importance of restrictive planning; we do want "master plans," zoning and other forms of negative planning—the kind based on the commandment "Thou Shalt Not." But let's recognize that positive stimulative planning is of even greater importance. The command "Thou Shalt" is vastly stronger than "Thou Shalt Not!"

Let's change negative planning into preventive planning. "Thou Shalt Not" sounds to my ears too much like regimentation. I fear that the analogy of planning a town with planning a building or an engineering structure has been overdrawn. An architect's blueprint shows a plan for building, a static structure. It can be designed and built according to plan, and deviation from plan may be a very serious matter. But a zoning plan, or a master plan for a growing dynamic community is an entirely different story. It is a record of ideas which, if too rigidly applied, may put the community in a strait jacket. It is useful not as a blueprint to be slavishly followed, but rather as a proposal to be revised, fitted, changed, as soon as the ink is dry. I like to think of the Regional Plan of Washington, which I developed some ten years ago, as a picture of opportunities which should be left open for the next generation to adapt to their needs. It is a preventive plan—to prevent this generation from getting in the way of our successors.

We want more than prevention. We have seen by the way things

have gone in Europe these last few months that preventive plans are not enough. We must have positive proposals too, a program of action and stimulants to cause action. The next phase in the development of the so-called planning movement should now be emphasized: the combination of programs and plans. The time has come to focus our research, our pictures, plans and dreams into practical programs.

Among the planning practitioners there is an ancient war over programming and planning. They talk about them as though they were two inconsistent processes, and ask which shall come first? The old story, you know of the hen and the egg! And the answer, of course, is that we have to have both plans and programs at the same time. To do useful planning, the planning agencies must be in there fighting before the battle starts, for planning is looking ahead to anticipate problems. The best chance to coordinate plans is while they are being formulated and before they crystallize. But the planning agency must be in at the finish also with a practical solution—a program.

I have used fighting terms in these remarks, more than warranted no doubt, but that is the all pervasive spirit of these terrible times in world affairs. In such times, all of us who are concerned with planning agencies are asking what should be the role of planning in the immediate emergency of national defense. The times call for action programs. We can help that way. But we can play an even more useful role, I think, by "sticking to our last"—the long-range view. The things that must or may be done because of the emergency can be done without regard to their long-range implications or they can be done, in most cases equally well, in ways which push ahead towards long-range objectives. It behooves all planning agencies to keep looking ahead to those objectives and to serve as reference points on the relation of immediate proposals to long-range plans.

Now more than ever those in authority need facts, knowledge of what we have, and the tools of research. The planning agency is organized to make those facts immediately available and to do the research work that is needed. Planning agencies in cities, states and in the federal government ought to have the knowledge of our resources upon which both emergency and long-range plans can be based.

I want to stress a statement which the National Resources Planning Board has made repeatedly, that planning is and must remain advisory only. But advice can be cogent, insistent and well-timed! It is part of the plan, is it not, that planning advice should be all of those things?

Planning is advisory. It takes the long view. Planning must be based on facts and more facts. It needs more practical positive programs. It must be developed "from the ground up." I believe that planning can be one of the great mainstays of democracy. I would go further and say that planning is both essentially democratic and essential to democracy. But

if we are going to plan wisely we must have the participation of people in towns, villages, cities and states, in households, in business and in government.

The National Resources Planning Board and its predecessors have steadfastly worked and aided the decentralization of planning. They have urged, pleaded, and coaxed the organization and active work of state and local planning agencies. And we have come a long way in the last few years.

Our latest record shows slightly fewer local planning agencies but much more action. To the list we have added a new group of planning organizations in 300 soil conservation districts, over 1,120 county land-use agricultural committees, and upwards of 232 housing authorities, fifteen of which report they are doing comprehensive long-range city planning. Ten years ago there were only one or two state planning agencies, now there are 43. Interstate or regional planning has grown through commissions for interstate cooperation, special investigations, regional planning commissions and committees, drainage basin committees, etc. At the federal level, planning groups in bureaus and departments are increasing in number and usefulness and the National Resources Planning Board has been recognized as a continuing agency within the President's executive office. The organization aspects of the planning movement have grown amazingly in a few years.

The wherewithal for organized planning is also provided nowadays in larger amounts, more evenly distributed over the country. City planning and zoning agencies, according to a preliminary tabulation of those reports received in the current local planning survey of the Resources Board, indicate that they have this year over \$1,500,000 of appropriated funds plus almost \$900,000 of WPA allotments. State planning appropriations are running over \$700,000 per year, and WPA allocations for 1939 state planning projects were just under \$3,000,000. We will all agree that these figures are insufficient to do the job we want the planning agencies to do, but let's find encouragement in the very substantial increase they show over the figures for ten years ago.

The products of our efforts are hard to measure or appraise, but they are to say the least encouraging. We—that is, all planning agencies—have given a large part of our attention to research, fact-finding inventories. The “survey” stage in the development of plans is always the most difficult because there is no tangible construction or act of a legislative body to point to as a record or accomplishment. It has sometimes been difficult to persuade appropriation committees that “research” as a basis for future plans and action is more important than some unplanned project whose cost would pay for all kinds of planning over ten or twenty years.

Out of this “survey” or fact-finding activity, states, counties and cities have gotten new insight into their problems, new understanding of their resources, and growing public interest in the ways at hand to make more

effective use of those resources for the common good. The process of putting together facts and figures to give a clear picture is the first step in planning. In military terms it is called "the estimate of the situation." Most of our big cities, many small ones, almost all of the states now have an "estimate of the situation" on which to base plans for defense and for development.

In the last ten years we have broadened the base upon which planning rests, in several directions. Perhaps the most important gain has been in the enormous increase in the number of active participants in planning work. We want planning done by the people who are affected. That is the democratic way. By participation in planning, citizenship is broadened in significance and meaning. It is the obligation of the free citizen of a free country to do his or her share of dreaming, planning—to see visions.

Another way in which planning has broadened is in scope. This is the same subject on which I have twice previously addressed the national conference, so you probably don't want to hear me talk about it again. I wonder if anyone present remembers what such terms as "charting," "programming," "budgeting," "organizing," "mapping," "coursing," "projecting" or "purposing" were supposed to mean when they were added to the planning lexicon in 1933? The need for those new words grew out of the sudden expansion of planning activities in all kinds of new fields under the stress of another "emergency." Now most of those activities are recognized parts of planning. Will the present emergency produce another expansion of equal significance?

The resources with which the planners are now concerned can be thought of as divided into four general groups:

1. *Human Resources*—always first because all of our planning is presumably for human benefit in the last analysis. What can we plan for the health, morale, education, training, and vigor of the spirit of our people? Here in the United States, we boast of our inventive genius, our medical progress, our technical skills. Are they just raw materials, or do we know how to use them for our own individual enjoyment and for the common good? Admittedly, we have only begun to plan—programs of health, education, science, and morale. The President's proposal for universal service challenges the imagination, vision and ability of our people to a new scale and intensity of planning effort.

2. *Natural Resources*—the raw materials out of which American civilization has been and will be made, and I say "American" purposely to include the whole hemisphere. We have not yet found the balance between exploration for immediate use and profit, as contrasted to preservation for the benefit of future generations. The middle road of conservation gains more and more adherents, but like all middle roads it is a rough, uncertain way. Planning can light that road and make it plainer.

3. *Man-made or Facilities Resources*—our industrial plant for conver-

sion of raw materials into useful goods, our transportation and communication systems, our power plants and transmission lines, our houses and business buildings. Of course, the location, time of construction, and much of the operation of these man-made resources can or could be planned if we wanted to. Those we have included in definitions of "public works" are being more and more planned and programmed. Others are "controlled" to a limited extent through preventive planning techniques like zoning and platting. Here, I think, is the greatest opportunity for positive planning—both for the emergency and for long-range objectives.

4. *Institutional Resources*—our ways of doing things; our economic system, our governmental system, our ethics, our spiritual resources. The most important of all planning problems today seems to me to be how to defend our American civilization, ideals, liberties, and rights against totalitarian, authoritarian ideas of Fascism, Naziism, and communism, without having to sacrifice our liberties while we defend them. But, as I said at the outset of these remarks, we must face the certainty of change; we must plan for change. Problems of defense will compel changes. Competition with a different kind of economic system will inevitably cause adjustments in our own system. Intercourse between nations based on decency can't continue indefinitely if one side ignores the rules of the Marquis of Queensbury and punches below the belt. I don't pretend to know the answers. I am sure, however, that periods of great and sudden change are the "tides in the affairs of men which taken at the flood, lead on to fortune," for the planners and the planning movement. For planners with stout hearts and keen brains now is the moment of opportunity. If we make use of this opportunity we can "ride the whirlwind." We can, if we pursue planning policies which emphasize the need for correlated facts and the discovery of the strategic points in the formulation of policy at which programs and decisions can be effected by well-informed public opinion.

One of my father's sermons is on the subject of the Fifth Wheel. I forget the Biblical text (that is the privilege of a minister's son), but the idea is that the fifth wheel has been the customary description of an unnecessary accessory, a clumsy addition to an otherwise efficient vehicle that interferes with its use. Having fully demonstrated how useless a fifth wheel is, my father then proceeds to emphasize that it is the most important wheel in the whole automobile—it's the steering wheel. We cannot get along without it!

The mechanism of the steering wheel is our planning organization. The American people are behind the steering wheel. It is up to them to do the steering, to decide where we are going. The planning organization does not make the decision, but it is the tool through which the decision influences the many moving parts of the mechanism. It is a correlating device concerned with direction.

For the last seven years, following in the footsteps of previous efforts

in the same direction, the National Resources Planning Board and its predecessors have tried to bring together the facts and knowledge on which major decisions of policy must be based. We have been trying to establish that: (1) Planning—forethought, preparedness, is essential to the orderly conduct of the public's business (as in private business). (2) Planning is the organization of facts to facilitate decision by the elected representatives of the people. It is advisory only. (3) Planning is a democratic process, involving participation in gathering facts and in suggesting solutions by all concerned. From the ground up! (4) Planning is an essential counterpart to budgeting. We cannot measure everything in terms of money. The planning agency must supply other terms of reference: "Liberty, the pursuit of happiness"—the common welfare. To be practical and useful planning must result in programs and specific proposals. (5) Planning is essential to the survival and reinvigoration of democracy. "Without vision, the people perish."

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

REPORTER: Harold W. Lautner, *Executive Secretary, American Institute of Planners.*

DISCUSSION LEADERS: Frank A. Kittredge, *Regional Director, National Park Service.*

Carl Landauer, *University of California.*

Samuel C. May, *Chairman, California State Planning Board.*

S. B. Show, *Regional Forester, United States Forest Service.*

Discussion of, and interest in, this session followed rather closely the premise in Mr. Eliot's paper; namely, that the nation is aroused to the immediate necessity of using and mobilizing our resources for defense.

Mr. Landauer especially endorsed Mr. Eliot's statement that this great emergency had created a tremendous opportunity for planning. He pointed out that we all undoubtedly would have preferred to see the opportunity come in a different way. But in that it had come this way, we would stand the test. Mr. Landauer went on to say that one of the greatest decisions had been made by America in recent weeks when it decided to rearm in competition with the totalitarian states. In reality that means as far as the field of planning is concerned that America is forced into accepting a planned economy. He thought that there was, however, great danger in underrating comprehensive planning and that the type of planning which the Industrial Mobilization Plan, for instance, envisaged was entirely inadequate for the situation that we are now facing, particularly for the reason that we are dealing with the necessity of planning our resources for a period of semi-war. Mr. Landauer pointed out that there was a danger in thinking that it was enough to establish a preference for orders coming from the War Department or airplane

industry. In this period of rearmament it is essential to plan not only for the use of war materials directly, but for civilian needs as well, because we cannot effectively plan for armament alone.

It was brought out in the speaker's paper and several times in the discussion that the most important planning problem today is how to defend our American civilization, ideals, liberties and rights against totalitarian ideas of Fascism, Naziism and communism without having to sacrifice our liberties while having to defend them. Mr. May, in his discussion, pointed out the great difference between totalitarian and democratic planning. Democratic planning in this country would not only aid government, but it would tend to create more democracy. He pointed for example to the agricultural program in this country and to the NRA. In the agricultural program our plans were formulated to fit in with the local program. The NRA was merely setting up machinery whereby business could plan for itself, section by section. Mr. May argued that the defense program gave an added opportunity to planners because it solidified the nation on all types of programs, and he realistically pointed out that the war would not last forever and that some day we would come back to a peace-time kind of planning. One factor he stressed was that we must make our democracy efficient. Government, he said, has become administrative in character whether we like it or not. The more complicated an automobile becomes the more essential it is to have all controls on the dashboard. We have the idea that integration is an evil; we must get away from that idea. We must give power for administrative machinery to our government so that it can be just as efficient as that in any totalitarian state.

Along the lines above and in the general discussion, Professor Robert B. Pettingill disagreed with the premise that we are to have a large defense program. He did not wish that it be taken for granted that we could preserve what was best in the American tradition by embarking upon a gigantic preparedness program. He suggested that it was possible that our failure to find a national capitalistic, democratic way out of our economic dilemma might be the reason for our trying to find the way out by a preparedness program. Mr. Hugh R. Pomeroy, however, could see no great issue in the discussion at this point, nor could he agree with Professor Pettingill that there was an escapist attitude in what had been said. He felt that the discussion had brought out that planning is a means of making democracy efficient, whether it be in facing an international threat or in facing the problem of readjusting our economic structure because we had reached the end of an age in our country.

Professor Arthur G. Coons, although willing to embark upon a program of preparedness and economic planning, challenged the unwarranted assumption that the transition from peace-time to war-time planning would be easy. The transition, he felt, was the greatest challenge of all.

Mr. B. H. Kizer, in referring to Mr. Eliot's paper, pleaded for the recognition that there is really only creative, positive planning; the other kind which goes with it as protection is the use of the police power.

Mr. Kittredge discussed the use of our resources in relation to our national parks. He pointed out that one of our present tasks is planning for the conservation of our resources in ways to make America impregnable against propaganda and sabotage. He said that we are accustomed to thinking of our natural resources and land use in terms of dollars worth of production—the value of grain or milk or meat or lumber or ore. But it is the purpose of the national parks to save and protect superlative scenery, typical areas, typical forests, geology, wild life, all flora and fauna of the country—for the education, recreation and the inspiration of the people.

Mr. Show by means of maps described the various land uses in California, the "self-contained empire." He brought out the fact that tight boundaries cannot be drawn around the various natural resources, that they are closely tied together and overlap. The national forests are intimately tied in with livestock, timber, water supply and recreation zones as well as with mineral resources. The crux of the planning problem of the national forests is the interrelation of these various uses. Here are found competing demands for exclusiveness. The Forest Service's basic principle has been to compare uses. Multiple-use management is the somewhat ponderous title given this endeavor. The Service has had to work out a multiple of techniques for conservation and has also had to deal with all the local town, city, county, state and regional planning problems and keep in touch with the groups concerned about them. The result has been truly a community program.

Miss Harlean James paid tribute to the Forest Service for its restriction of grazing on the national forests. Forests are being restored where they were overgrazed and in many cases are actually better than they were twenty years ago.

Mr. L. Deming Tilton, presiding at this session, stated that there seemed to be at least one single thread running through the conference so far. It was that at last planners were beginning to recognize that planning means discipline and that this discipline is essential if we are going to carry out our plans.

Public Education for Planning

FREDERICK BIGGER

Chairman, Pittsburgh City Planning Commission

The work of citizens' planning organizations is to be discussed, I assume, partly because of the implication that such bodies should deal with public education in planning. In the second part of this paper I draw upon the experience of one such organization, which is now well along in its twenty-third year of existence.

Before making a choice among the high lights of progress and defeat which accent the life of any active group, it is proper to have a frame of reference. The first part of this paper attempts to outline that frame of reference against which any citizens' planning organization may be evaluated.

PART I

Learning and teaching: In most fields of endeavor, there are processes and operations which must be learned by some persons and taught by others. Usually the process of education in these fields—in that of planning, for example—is concentrated primarily in the field itself, and in those schools which attempt to prepare their students for later practice in that field. In the better schools, academic training is adjusted so as to bring the student into direct contact, as frequently as possible, with actual practitioners in that field and with their work. The persons from whom planning may be learned are those who teach and those who practice planning. Academic training without practice, or without proper contact with actual practice, is likely to be inadequate and may be distinctly harmful. These axioms are stated here because we are discussing education.

Two of the objectives of planning: There are two obvious objectives which both the planner, and the teacher of planning, must have in mind. One of them is the constant improvement of the technique of planning. This must not be minimized in importance; but it is not the only aim of the planner. The second objective, in the minds of the planner and the educator, is that of directing planning technique toward its successful application upon immediate problems, and its gradual coming to grips with planning problems of broader scope or longer range. Such orientation of planning technique will produce programs—of public improvement, for example—adjusted to the limitations of social and economic background and capacity. Probably programs thus evolved will be suc-

cessful in direct proportion to the skill and thoroughness which have been devoted to the prior planning study.

Education beyond the planning field: There is another phase of education, with respect to planning, to which citizens who are laymen may be subjected. Before we can get at that matter more definitely, it is important to consider an intermediate step.

Significant community needs: Of the many fundamental needs in modern American communities there are four that I want to mention as of especial significance to planning.

1. The need for an official planning agency which is nonpolitical and nonpartisan—an agency which is competent, and which will bear approximately the same relationship to the local government as an industrial research organization bears to the parent industry or to industry as a whole.

2. The need to eliminate most, perhaps all, promotional activity from the planning board's program. Such activity tends to create resentment in other departments of the local government and among those citizens who have contrary ideas, and may weaken the planning board's essentially objective point of view. Moreover the intellectual integrity and ethical standards required of the professional staff planners do not lend themselves to the devious ways of the typical promoter.

3. The need to explain, constantly, the problems with which the planning agency has to deal, to explain the advantages and disadvantages of alternative solutions of those problems, and to explain the planners' own specific recommendations. This need to explain is a public service which official planning agencies often are unable to satisfy. They cannot do so because of limited budget and personnel. Explanations can easily be dull; they are not regarded as "news"; and generally they appear in the daily papers only when a newsworthy controversy is raging.

4. The need to have a citizens' planning organization of entirely unofficial character, not as a substitute for the official planning board but as a supplement to it. (If there is a planning director but no official planning board at the town hall, the citizens' planning organization might function as an advisory body.) It may be induced to do some of the neglected general planning if the town's budget and personnel, or its policies, prevent that planning from being done by a municipal agency.

Citizens as planning board members: Appointive, unpaid, citizen members of official planning boards may bring to their task important special aptitudes and experience. Perhaps they are members of one or another of the recognized professions. Frequently, some or all of the planning board members are laymen, with respect to the planning field. These laymen, together with those who come from a field of professional or specialized experience, must acquire a greater breadth of vision, a larger understanding of the relationships of things to be planned, and knowledge of the administrative machinery set up to deal with public

affairs. In other words, these planning board members must become more fully educated as a result of their cooperative service in the public interest.

A citizens' planning organization: It is axiomatic that a citizens' planning organization must be unofficial. It should be nonpolitical and non-partisan, and be free of special interest. The persons who constitute the nucleus of such a body might be much the same types of citizen as are found on the official planning board. Obviously, they must be able to work together. Collectively, they must have sufficient intelligence, knowledge, courage, vigor and influence to help the official agency to function properly—something not easy to do when we recognize that the policy of the local government, in cases of controversy, is apt to be weighted less with the analyses of planners than with the political or financial potency of pressure groups or individuals who are to be appeased. It takes a long time for impartial planning technique to become acceptable as the soundest public compromise between rival vested interests.

The functions of a citizens' planning organization, in a democratic society, would include: the understanding support of the official planning board; constructive criticism of that board if it fails in, or departs from, its proper functions; education of its own members to an understanding of planning procedures and possibilities; and a selective education of the citizens of the community where, collectively, public opinion is supposed to reside, but where actually there are as many variations and permutations of interest as there are identifiable pressure groups.

Somewhere, off at the ends of such active steps in study and planning, there may be some enthusiastic but qualified promotion, designed to get something done. When such times come, however, the danger is that the planning organization will revert more and more to the less disciplined activities of a so-called improvement association. It has happened, at such moments, that the mayor and local legislators have not been conscious, seemingly, of any difference between such a body, with its background of planning study, and any one of many sectional pressure groups.

What types of citizen: Except for official planning board members, the individuals who organize and become the leaders of a citizens' planning organization certainly are the first of all the groups of lay citizens who must be subjected to some kind of educational process, whether they admit the need of it or not. It is a very human error to presume that success in one field indicates competence in another. And we know that one of the most specious assumptions of democratic emotionalism is that the possession of the franchise is synonymous with possession of knowledge of what to do and how to do it.

If we were to be given the power to choose the persons to lead a citizens' planning organization, there would be every reason to appraise carefully each potential candidate. We could not ignore these facts: that

there are the widest differences in individual educability, in incentive toward self-education, in the quality and scope of civic consciousness and responsibility, in individual competence in the commercial world or in the professions, in the attitudes of people of wealth and power, and in individual emotional driving power—both disciplined and undisciplined.

Some qualities alone are inadequate: The leaders of a citizens' planning organization will not be competent to lay the foundations for increased efficiency and accomplishment in planning if their dominant characteristics are merely the possession of civic consciousness, a sense of civic responsibility (which is a different matter), and good intentions. Such a group can be little more than a presumably ill-informed evangelistic society.

Suppose there is an aggressive salesman or promoter in a group of that kind. What is there for him to sell or promote? I believe it is impossible, inherently, for him to emotionalize his fellow citizens into demanding community self-discipline. And self-discipline is not far from being basic in the planning process. Such an advocate may be able to persuade people to want something, or to get something done, and at the same time he may be unconcerned or uninformed about what should be done and how it should be done. He may confuse the local scene, and the calm discussion which is so much needed. He may be impatient with the local planning board for no sound reason, but only as an expression of his own emotional frustration. Moreover, when he has induced a "public demand," that demand in itself is not evidence that those who make it really understand the problems to be solved, or that they grasp the full significance of what is being advocated.

Fundamental decision on program necessary: How can a small group of citizens help the entire community to understand its needs, to understand the procedures and capacities of their local government, to understand the difference between an improvement which will solve a problem and a proposal which would solve no problem adequately but instead create new and more difficult problems?

We do not have to pursue this kind of inquiry very far to see that we should make a very important differentiation before we launch the organization. We must see the difference and make the choice between whether merely to promote and persuade in order to get something done, or whether to cultivate knowledge and understanding as prerequisites to something else,—that something else, of course, ultimately to be resolved in terms of practicable programs of improvement. The second of these two alternatives is the only possible one to accept if we are concerned with what is really education, and if we are willing to undertake the long and difficult task of laying proper foundations for planning and achievement. There can be no doubt that a citizens' planning organization, even if it is not fairly ignorant regarding planning, when it begins its civic activities, must give thought to its own education.

But when we make this decision as to the character of the group's program, we should not forget that, periodically, the community will become vocal with impatience because the planners are not ready for the approval, or construction, of something they have not been allowed the time to study. That will be an evil hour, if the planners cannot take it, and if they do not use the crisis to lay another foundation stone of public understanding. And it will not be a carefree time for the citizens' planning organization if its own perspective is lost and its morale is broken down by the impatience voiced in other quarters. Many temporary defeats—and there have been many—may be traced directly or indirectly to this cause. How to reduce the number of such defeats in the coming years, how to recognize that what appears to be defeat may be only a temporary set-back—these are two of the questions in the minds of those concerned with public education for planning.

Selective education: I have referred to one of the tasks of a citizens' planning organization as that of effecting a selective education of the local citizens. As a matter of fact, selectivity is characteristic of what I have been trying to say when referring to planners selected for their professional aptitudes and skill, planning board members selected for certain qualifications other than political or partisan, and leaders of a citizens' planning organization, etc.

I am not familiar with pedagogic terminology and connotations; and the term "selective education" may not be a good one. However, I think my meaning should be reasonably clear. Remembering the inequalities of the educational system and its achievements, it seems reasonable not to try to reach, first of all, the lower levels of understanding and intellectual capacity when we are explaining current planning problems. Efforts to reach down that far will be made, in simple fashion, by someone; but no busy planner, or planning board, or citizens' planning organization will have the funds and facilities to do this, either appropriately or thoroughly. The causes of community maladjustments, which so often determine the planner's problems, are too complex to be explained easily even to the average newspaper reader. The explanations which must be given (to which I have referred a number of times) should go to a selected list of persons, rather than indiscriminately to everyone. Very likely there will be small groups, within the larger selected list, to whom it will be desirable to give particular types of explanation based on an estimate of the recipients' peculiar interest and point of view.

Inadequate preparation is deplored: Before turning to the second half of this paper, it is proper to confess that this attempt to set my thoughts in order has been motivated, in part, by some impressions that have come to me during the past few years. Perhaps some of us have been expecting too great results from too little preparation. Throughout the country, many official planning boards have been created; and many lay members

have been appointed to serve on those boards. It is my impression that there are far too many such planning board members who are lost in a sort of no-man's land between, on the one side, a going political administration and, on the other side, citizens who lack knowledge, interest, and ability to distinguish between planning which is good, inadequate or bad.

PART II

After the early mapping of streets in what is now the downtown business district of Pittsburgh—in 1764 and 1784—one hundred and twenty-six years elapsed before the beginnings of a modern approach to planning were undertaken. In 1910 a legally constituted city planning commission was created; and in 1918 there was organized by leading citizens a privately financed Citizens Committee on City Plan. It was incorporated, in 1920, as a nonprofit organization, under the unwisely selected title "The Municipal Planning Association," which title was changed, in 1938, to "Pittsburgh Regional Planning Association."

The charter recites the three purposes of the organization: "(a) to promote the orderly and efficient development of municipalities; (b) to promote the adoption of scientific methods of city and municipal planning; (c) to secure constructive publicity in matters pertaining to municipal planning problems and their solution; and to these ends to collect, to classify, to analyze, to correlate, to interpret and to publish facts with reference to municipal planning needs, methods and benefits; and in connection therewith, to prepare and to publish for free distribution, scientific model municipal studies and plans, under the authority and provisions of the Act of General Assembly of July 15, 1897, Section I, Paragraph 3, Subdivisions II and III, which provide for the incorporation of organizations for the support of charitable, educational and scientific undertakings."

Pre-organization activity: I cannot tell this story without an appallingly frequent use of the first personal pronoun. But you will discount this, I am certain, for there can be no disagreement with the fact that, in any group undertaking—and that is what we are discussing—one person alone accomplishes nothing. It is the group which succeeds or fails.

I shall refer to the organization of citizens as "the Committee," so as to distinguish it from other bodies. When the Committee was formed, in 1918, the by-that-time moribund official commission took on a new lease of life, and almost immediately the county commissioners appointed a county planning commission of well-chosen party men, perhaps to rubber stamp the county's proposals. We later helped to secure legal reconstitution of the county planning commission along modern lines. Op-

portunity is lacking to tell of the frustrated efforts of the city's first planning board members. When their annual appropriation had dropped to the dramatic low of \$100 for stamps, something had to be done.

From an entirely different avenue of approach, I devoted four or five years to lectures in schools and elsewhere on architecture (my basic profession), housing and town planning. With the one important civic club of the region, there were such activities as writing housing legislation, drafting the state enabling act for zoning, reviewing and investigating long lists of tax-delinquent properties offered for sale by the city, and various other duties which the leaders of that club decided to undertake. The community had had Frederick Law Olmsted's early street report (1910) and several transit reports—each slowly getting itself forgotten in the usual manner.

In a then dominantly Republican city of a traditionally Republican state and in a city of heavy industrial and manufacturing operations, it was not hard to imagine where was the source of both the political and financial powers. Being privileged to be in contact with three men of considerable wealth and influence, it was my privilege to share with them the job of actually organizing the Committee. For better or worse, when the time was ripe, a new organization was decided upon rather than an investment in an expansion of the program of the civic club.

Money: The original leaders surrounded themselves with other business men and the first announcement of the names of the board of directors brought fan mail which advocated everything up to the completion of Utopia.

At the first meeting, in five minutes, there were subscriptions totalling \$20,000. I outlined a program and estimated an outlay of \$400,000. Practically without argument, or flinching, this was cut to \$250,000 as a probable maximum outlay to cover the first three or four years. Professional planners of reputation were invited from other cities to appraise the program, to check the estimated cost, to offer alternatives, and to present their credentials as possible expert consultants. To supplement voluntary subscriptions, others were solicited. At the peak there were over four hundred subscribing firms, corporations and individuals. The number fluctuated through the years. It is now low. The aggregate expenditures over the past twenty-two years ran beyond \$300,000.

First studies and reports: During the first four and one-half years, six comprehensive plan reports were completed. Studies had been developed by the technical staff under the watchful eye of the visiting consultant. Board members, in committees of overlapping membership, spent afternoons and evenings mastering the material and making it their own. Seldom, I believe, has a better job of self-education in planning been done by any group. The recommendations, the opinions, and the judgment were those of the group; and to that I credit much of the persistence of

the work, and its resistance to the inevitable grumblings of those dissatisfied with the findings.

Relationship to official planning board: One of the three instigators of the Committee was a member of the city planning commission. Later five of the Committee had been appointed members of the official body. The overlapping was healthy; both agencies functioned; and there were no ill effects. Help was given in asking for adequate normal appropriations for money, for a much needed topographic-geodetic survey, for preparation of a zoning ordinance with imported consultant services, for special study of the central district's articulated loop traffic thoroughfares.

A periodical: other exposition: Early in the Committee's life, it engaged an excellent publicity man. He established a periodical, to which the technical staff contributed. At first it appeared each month of the year, except in summer; later issues were less frequent (sometimes because funds were low, but often because nothing of especial importance needed to be explained). From 1923 to 1935 the periodical was my responsibility. The last issue, No. 51, appeared in January 1939; but before this paper is read another number probably will have appeared. The periodical, with letter-size pages, varied from four to sixteen pages per issue. After the report-making period, current city hall events were explained, cartooned or otherwise illustrated. The Committee's cooperative work with the civic club and chamber of commerce was reported. We mentioned a junior civic club's study of planning proposals—particularly those relating to the playground system. The mailing list, slowly built up and classified, later rejuvenated, is now without minor classifications but totals between eleven and twelve thousand names.

Many talks were given throughout the city. We appeared before city council in committees, and singly. Most often we were represented by a small delegation. As time went on that duty fell upon two of us, and finally upon me. I have to report finding myself thus on the firing line several times while my army was retreating over the hill! I report this as evidence of fluctuating vitality in a group of otherwise active business men. When so many times the action had to be in opposition to ill-timed or poorly planned proposals, it was necessary that I have explicit understandings with my executive committee, to avoid misrepresenting them or placing them in any position to feel embarrassment.

Joint planning conference: At one period, when a large county bond issue program was being belatedly planned, the Committee instigated, and participated in, a conference group with representatives of the two official planning agencies. After two years of this, with all formal gestures perfectly performed, everyone finished the task quite worn out. It has never seemed possible to reestablish such a group, although it is needed as much as before.

Readjustments: I am telescoping one part of my history into another.

Going back to the time when the last of the six plan reports was distributed, I note that my recommendation was approved. This allowed me to go easy on stirring up widespread but premature interest in an overwhelming number of report recommendations. Instead, as one of the unpaid members of the official planning agency, the Committee allowed me to help that commission and its staff, as if I were a paid employee. This made up in part for inadequate numbers of staff, and allowed me to direct the self-education of some of the younger staff members. During these seven or eight years my work continued with the private Committee. I served as its technical adviser, executive officer, editor of its periodical and writer of explanations of planning problems for lay readers. Those were very busy years during which all of us, at different levels of experience and skill, were educating ourselves further and helping others to do likewise. These activities naturally expanded and ramified through participation in the work of other organizations, such as those devoted to housing, etc.

The low point: A year or two after the financial crash, the Committee closed its offices and stopped all expenditure. Several of us continued to serve on the official planning body; but a local political and partisan upset affected all municipal departments, and finally left me as the sole survivor of the Committee group to serve upon the official planning board. The Committee's officers met, informally, a few times in a few years. They gathered their adherents and came forward nobly when an emergency in planning arose with which the official body could not cope. Slowly the idea of the need for revitalizing the dormant private organization grew, up to the point of actual renewal of expenditure and activity, late in 1937.

Revival: In 1938 and 1939, under the present changed name, the Committee has become more dynamic. Its private view of its obligations stressed three aims:

1. To help the official agency, including assistance in eliminating some maladjustments resulting from the municipal administration changes. To these duties I have devoted the major part of my time; and the official board and its staff seem to me now to be in better condition for service than ever before.

2. To try to coordinate the points of view and plans of city, county, and state highway planners, who represent different jurisdictions in one respect, and have differing responsibilities—but who also ought to have their activities coordinated whenever one political entity spends money for improvements within the area of another political entity.

3. To try to effect some working basis among rival property or business interests of the small but vitally important central business district which is known as "the Golden Triangle."

For many years I have been a member of the board of directors of the

Committee. Because of my unpaid membership on the official planning body and my paid consulting service to the Committee, we have anticipated my eventual withdrawal from one or the other. That move was to be determined by the results of the effort to reconcile business interests which had objected to the official and objective appraisal of projects they had promoted. In May of this year I withdrew as the paid consultant of the Committee. I shall watch hopefully for successful progress of the citizens' Committee, and its adherence to the objectives stated in its charter.

Physical improvements: One of our downtown waterfront thoroughfare improvements nears completion, according to plans of the city, although being largely paid for by the county. A new out-of-town expert, with a reputation for getting things done, was paid a very large sum to make a nontechnical report on a thoroughfare program. This involved dramatic presentation of some of our local traditional plans, exactly or with slight modification, plus a new scheme or two. That report, or projects mentioned in it, and rival claims are the basis of the controversies of the present period. A second waterfront thoroughfare scheme is in the planning stage along lines close to those suggested by the maker of the dramatic report. Other highway improvements, to cost many millions, engage the attention of the planners and the conversation of interested groups.

Attracting less attention, part of the city's bond issue improvement program, now nearing completion, involves belated construction of many recreation buildings and other structures on city playgrounds—to the tune of about two million dollars. Thus, there are real accomplishments to be seen, after twenty years, in this most socially significant phase of the Committee's original comprehensive plans.

CONCLUSION

It has been extraordinarily difficult for me to distinguish what has been contributed by official and unofficial planning bodies, by civic groups and individuals. Confused as this present story may have been, it yet shows, I think, something of the local significance of Pittsburgh's planning practice and its education for planning.

And, finally: I have wondered for a long time whether a more complete story than the one written here, and with explanations of specific situations, could be a helpful document to anyone. As I watch the rapidity with which books are scanned, as I detect the curtain of words and false impressions thus secured, and as I puzzle over the loss of clarity of thinking which this so often involves, it seems to me to be more than ever true that no one ever learns except by experience. And I think that is pertinent to the problem of education for planning.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

REPORTER: Carl Feiss, *School of Architecture, Columbia University.*

DISCUSSION LEADERS: Philip H. Elwood, *Chairman, Region VI, National Resources Planning Board.*

George G. Gross, *Executive Secretary, Florida State Planning Board.*

Kenneth O. Warner, *Director, Northwest Regional Council.*

Paul Hanna of Stanford University, who was the second speaker on education for planning, had not prepared a paper in advance so I shall attempt to give here the highlights of his address.

Professor Hanna spoke under the title of "Public School and University Education for Planning: An Opportunity for Planners and a Challenge to Educators." As many of you here know, Mr. Hanna is director of the Commission on Resources and Education, a new organization operating under the joint action of the National Education Association, the Progressive Education Association and the United States Office of Education. The commission is financed by the General Education Board of the Rockefeller Foundation and, as explained by Mr. Hanna, will prepare a series of reports and sponsor conferences and workshops with educators and planners.

"The professional planner," Mr. Hanna stated, "is the agent of a democratic people responsible for inventorying our resources and for creating designs for producing the fullest life possible out of the planned balance of all natural and human resource factors. The professional educator is the agent of a democratic people responsible for providing the trained intelligence and skill essential in the citizenry to make the vision and plans of the planners workable in a democratic manner."

Professor Hanna feels that public school and college teachers must get from the planner subject matter which has to be incorporated into the curriculum of all schools if education is to take a leading part in the proper development of the nation. Education has up to now not dealt sufficiently with the everyday realities of our culture and as a result the educational profession has lost its significance in the culture.

The Commission on Resources and Education hopes, therefore, to give teachers a chance to work closely with researchers and planners in producing teaching guides and instructional materials. It is organized to provide a cohesive professional group of educators to work with the planners in creating public understanding of planning problems and promises. Professor Hanna believes that children and youths must be given something worthwhile to do to which they can give their loyalty and unselfish energies and that this procedure should give teachers a

revitalization in the great crusade to put the United States on a permanent footing of defense and security against attacks from without and deterioration from within.

The first activity of the Commission on Resources and Education was the publication of a voluminous preliminary report called "The Role of Education in Utilizing Regional Resources," which is a critical bibliography for the use of teachers in the instruction of regional resources. The publication of this was followed by conferences of educators and planners of national prominence in Chicago and Milwaukee. Four regional conferences were held during the last year in the North Middle States, the Rocky Mountain States, the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest. In addition to these, a special conference with planners was held in Chicago last February to consider the role of education in planning. This summer a series of experimental workshops were conducted in the Pacific Northwest, in collaboration with the Northwest Regional Council and all types of educational institutions. At these workshops teachers met with representatives of a great variety of governmental agencies and the work of various research and planning groups was studied in detail.

It is Professor Hanna's hope that by working closely with the National Conference on Planning, with the National Resources Planning Board and with other planning groups throughout the country, it will be possible for educators to learn about planning programs and to discover ways and means of translating these programs into the school curricula. He believes this will be a means to arouse the 1,200,000 teachers in our country to their role in the permanent security of our culture, and that by bringing the student, the teacher, and the planning technician more closely together a public understanding of the needs for planning and the methods of solving them will be more readily expedited than in any other way.

In commenting on Mr. Bigger's paper, Mr. Philip Elwood emphasized the need for the training of planners themselves and the necessity of broadening the scope of their understanding and technique. He questioned "selective education," stating that "the franchise is not selective." Mr. Elwood went on to say that schools and colleges, and particularly professional schools including extension groups, should engage more actively in demonstration projects, and mentioned the fact that in his own department at Iowa State College three full-time workers are now engaged in demonstration work of a kind that has been going on there for nearly twenty years. Elwood stated also that every effort should be made to get students to feel responsibility toward the community. He mentioned the great need for educating the public official to the need for planning and used for illustration a short course to be given for city and county auditors at the University of North Dakota this winter. He also noted that some technical schools now require a certain amount of practical experience in close contact with field operations before granting the academic degree.

Mr. Eugene Taylor said that he felt that the lay members of official planning bodies and the individuals who constitute citizen planning organizations form two groups which can best be educated by the planner. It is up to those two groups to carry the ball further. However, under the present circumstances, he believes that it is inevitable that the official planning agency must do most of the work. He illustrated his statement by recalling the experience of the Chicago Plan Commission and its publication of *Wacker's Manual of the Plan of Chicago*, which was studied in schools for many years.

Mr. George Gross also questioned selective education and expressed his enthusiasm for the work that Professor Hanna had detailed. He asked that textbooks be prepared for the use of public schools.

Kenneth Warner suggested that the important thing would be to work on the translation of technical information into an easily understood language. He questioned the advisability of attempting to do large-scale education on a national basis, and expressed the opinion that regional and local material was of vital importance in the educational process after the general principles have been expounded. He illustrated his points by showing copies of pamphlets and books published for the use of teachers in the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. George F. Yantis, the very able chairman of the meeting, here urged the planner to remember that he is not omnipotent. Catherine Bauer thereupon threw a bombshell into a so far placid meeting by claiming that the planner had neglected or avoided the housing question and that no educational policy was complete which omitted housing as part of its program. Miss Bauer stated that housing was a stimulating and challenging subject to students and that planners were missing a real opportunity in not availing themselves of this stimulus. She said that planners worked in those "beautiful and evanescent elements"—air, land, water, natural resources, etc.—while the houser dealt with grim reality in his social and economic work. She claimed that 80 per cent of the really bitter housing fights, at least in western America today, are over planning matters and that the planner has not been of much help—particularly in site location work and in zoning for residential areas in the present slums.

Professor Hanna agreed with Miss Bauer and stated that, obviously, a properly balanced educational system would sensitize teachers to all types of social and economic problems.

Mr. Elwood challenged Miss Bauer's charge that "the many bitter housing fights," largely on site problems, were the planners' fault. He cited a statement that Mr. Yantis had made earlier in the meeting to the effect that planners are not able to change selfish interests which are really the actual cause for most of the local troubles. The local housing authority may or may not have had sufficient planning counsel and advice from competent planners throughout the housing program, he admitted.

Professor Feiss stated that from his experience at Columbia University

the average student of college age and the graduate student entering the professional planning course do not have sufficient background in the social and economic problems of the day. He stated that a survey of planning and housing education made under the auspices of NAHO four years ago had demonstrated clearly Hanna's point that the teaching of planning to teachers was practically non-existent.

Harold Bутtenheim, referring back to Frederick Bigger's paper, claimed that a citizens' organization, such as the Citizens' Housing Council of New York, could most successfully coordinate planning and housing problems and individual organizations.

There was considerable discussion as to the problems which the planners would face if mobs of school children were to invade their offices for information and assistance. Mr. Harold S. Osborne explained the experience of the planning board in Montclair, New Jersey, which encourages this very activity. He believes that this is one of the most important functions of a planning commission. Professor Feiss suggested that citizen groups might assist the local planning and housing agencies by acting as intermediaries. Miss Mary Jane Green and Russell Black brought up the question of textbooks and told of experiences indicating the need for them. Professor Hanna, however, felt that textbooks were not as important as good bibliographies and books which would show how to use properly the publications of planning agencies. The local revamping of such publications was possible and desirable, he said, but an overall textbook would be an impossibility. The general consensus at the meeting was that such guides were essential and that the emphasis should be placed on them rather than on textbooks.

County Planning in California

The first speaker, Mr. Ronald Campbell, gave a resume of work undertaken and contemplated in the suburban counties of Marin, Alameda, Santa Clara, Solano, Monterey and in his own county, San Mateo. He touched upon Napa and Santa Cruz county programs also, thus covering in his review work of this type in the area surrounding and adjacent to the city of San Francisco.

The general conditions and developmental trends which led these counties of northern California to establish planning commissions were briefly summarized by Mr. Campbell. Excellent support from citizen groups, he said, had been an important factor in providing the necessary impetus in the beginning of the movement. Some of the counties have well organized citizens' committees which consult with the official board. As the commissions have demonstrated ability to proceed and to render effective service on their limited budgets, the boards of supervisors of these counties have gained confidence in them and there is now strong dependence on them as material aids to proper conduct of the county's business. A majority of the present San Mateo board of supervisors, for example, are former members of the planning commission and in the nine years since its establishment the board has never reversed a decision of the commission.

Illustrating points in his discussion, Mr. Campbell referred to base maps of San Mateo County; he presented aspects of the master recreation plan and described the unique land acquisition program which is coupled with the plan.

In concluding his remarks, Mr. Campbell pointed to lack of unified rapid transit, need of coordination of major highways and parkways and for a regional park and recreation plan, as major planning problems of the San Francisco area.

In his chalk talk on the development of the Master Plan of Los Angeles County, Mr. William J. Fox brought out the close resemblance of present development to the plans prepared in earlier years. Mr. Fox outlined divisions of the master plan of the county which embrace the following:

1. *Conservation of Natural Resources or Assets*—Beaches, water supplies, fish, trees, scenery, etc.
2. *Land Utilization*—Indications of desirable ultimate uses of land, a general pattern for zoning.
3. *Recreation*—Location, character and improvement of playgrounds, parks, pleasure drives, etc.

4. *Streets and Highways*—Connections, extensions and widenings to create an efficient system of traffic thoroughfares.
5. *Transportation*—The provision of rail and truck transportation facilities, including terminals, routes, grade separations, etc.
6. *Transit*—The routing of streetcars or bus lines.
7. *Public Services*—Sewers, water supply, drainage, rubbish and garbage disposal, etc.
8. *Public Buildings*—Location and design of civic center, sites for schools, post office, library, etc.
9. *Community Design*—Standards and designs for subdivisions, commercial centers, etc.
10. *Housing*—Survey of housing needs and outline of housing plans and programs.
11. *Airports*—Airport planning—and control of site selection.

Mr. Fox emphasized the need for close coordination of the building department or enforcing agency and the planning body in order to obtain at all times an adherence to the developed plan and its latest revisions and current proposals. Examples were given of unfortunate results of failure to obtain such coordination.

Planning in Kern County, third largest in a state of large counties, was described by Mr. Chester A. James, planning engineer. Although San Joaquin Valley of "Grapes of Wrath" fame is in his county, Mr. James denied that housing constituted the county's greatest problem. Important agriculturally, the county also is credited with nearly one-half the oil fields of California, which supply 40 per cent to 45 per cent of the county tax revenue. Although the urban area is relatively small, there being extensive large private grazing and oil land holdings as well as one quarter of the total area in federal ownership, the commission has approved 59 subdivision plats totalling more than 5,000 lots in the last year.

The major attention of the Kern County Planning Commission has been concentrated upon preparation and adoption of the land-use plan and highway plan divisions of the county's master plan. The former divides all land in the county under the three classifications of valley areas, mountain areas, and desert areas, with subdivisions indicating types of appropriate development. These major divisions and their components are based upon soil surveys and other data supplied through cooperation of federal, state and local agricultural technicians and administrative officers.

The highway plan provides a basic right-of-way pattern. Data for the plan has been collected over a period of ten years. Existing use of county and state highways was determined by traffic counts. An inventory and classification of roads has been made. Effectuation of the highway plan depends with respect to procedure upon adoption of "precise plans"—as defined in California planning law—prepared by the planning commission

and adopted as "official plans" by the board of supervisors, the legislative body.

Mr. Frank McKee, Secretary of the San Francisco Division of the State Chamber of Commerce, in his observations on the work of the county planning commissions stressed the value of obtaining services of outstanding citizens as members of planning agencies or of citizen committees attached to official boards. He pointed to examples of need for planning and wastes brought about by failure to plan. He cited Kern, Santa Barbara and Los Angeles counties as illustrations of commissions which had the confidence of their supervisors and were achieving satisfactory results. Mr. McKee expressed his opinion of the importance of proceeding with planning programs gradually, laying stress on educating the public and obtaining the support of citizen groups while the program is being developed. This approach too is sound with respect to relations of the commission with the board of supervisors.

In his discussion of planning in Fresno County, Edgar C. Smith, surveyor of the county, described a number of disastrous consequences of the early lack of planning and of such planning tools as zoning and subdivision regulations. State highways have been reduced in efficiency and made unsightly by uncontrolled development along their rights-of-way; badly designed subdivisions have reduced the value or destroyed much land; irrigation canals in the county due to lack of over-all planning have caused much difficulty. Since a planning commission was established a few years ago progress has been made in dealing with the county's many problems of controlling and guiding development.

The commission has obtained the support of the county board, the FHA, realtors and a number of public bodies. Attention has been given to developing an appropriate zoning program, amendments having been prepared recently creating a rural residential district and governing height of structures surrounding airports.

Considerable opposition to zoning has been encountered. This has made difficult official adoption of the detailed maps of territory proposed to be covered by zoning regulations and has influenced the commission to devote greater attention to further development of the county master plan to establish more positively the county-wide frame of reference. The commission is continuing its efforts to obtain increased public understanding of the need for zoning. Mr. Smith strongly urged upon the planning commission the necessity of developing a master plan early in its program, and to take the public into its confidence. In concluding his remarks, Mr. Smith mentioned the difficulty of enforcement of planning measures where, as in Fresno County, the county surveyor is ex-officio a member and acts as secretary of the plan commission and in his regular capacity serves as zoning enforcement officer.

Dr. Walter Scott Franklin, President of the California County Planning Commissioners' Association, presided over the panel on county planning

which included Ronald Campbell, Engineer-Secretary, San Mateo County Planning Commission; William J. Fox, Chief Engineer, Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission; Chester A. James, Engineer, Kern County Planning Commission; Frank McKee, Secretary, San Francisco Division of the California State Chamber of Commerce; Edgar C. Smith, Fresno County Surveyor. Lorin W. Deewall, Engineer, San Diego County Planning Commission, acted as reporter for the session.

Migration and Resettlement of the People

CAREY McWILLIAMS

*Chief, Division of Immigration and Housing
State of California*

Between July 1, 1935, and September 1, 1939, approximately 350,000 migrants entered California across the California-Arizona border in quest of employment. This estimate is, of course, merely an approximation, as it does not take into consideration those migrants who entered the state by some mode of conveyance other than automobiles or who took some route other than across the California-Arizona border. Today we know a good deal about the population characteristics of these migrants, thanks largely to excellent studies that have been made by the Farm Security Administration and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. We know that the overwhelming majority of these people are American citizens earnestly in search of settlement, that the movement is made up primarily of families; that the heads of these families are men in their best working years eager to find new homes and new employment opportunities in California. Here, certainly, was a major challenge to planning resources in the West. The resettlement of these people presented problems of great moment and far-reaching implications. Here was an opportunity for California to bring about a better balance of rural and urban elements in its population, to achieve, perhaps, a more equitable land-settlement within the state and a fuller utilization of our rich natural resources. How has this challenge been met?

The unpleasant truth is that we have met the challenge by ignoring it. Our reactions to the issues involved have varied from outright hostility and organized opposition to a studied attempt to ignore the entire problem and to indulge in the childish pretense that it does not exist. In the meantime, however, resettlement has taken place. Hungry and destitute people cannot wait upon the indefinitely deferred action of social planners, nor can they mark time while an intelligent public opinion is formed in their behalf. In default of a plan or program for their guidance, the migrants have settled, wherever and however they could. With the exception of the guidance and direction supplied on a limited scale by the Farm Security Administration, the migrants have had to follow the dictates of chance and necessity in seeking resettlement. Far from meeting this challenge, I fear that, in the unforgettable phrase of Neville Chamberlain, we have "missed the bus."

What form, then, has this makeshift—this unplanned and undirected resettlement—taken in California? It has taken, essentially, the form of

a squatting or settling on the periphery of existing communities, both urban and rural. Driven from submarginal lands, migrants have located in California on unoccupied marginal areas. To illustrate this tendency, I want to use one or two existing communities by way of reference. Bell Gardens and Garvey Acres in Los Angeles County may be taken as examples of urban squatting. In 1934 the Bell Gardens community was virtually nonexistent; today it has a population of 26,000 people. Located in an unincorporated portion of the county, the community has no locally-organized fire or police protection. Local self-government is nonexistent. Sewer facilities do not exist. In the years since 1934, migrants have moved into the settlement and dug in, so to speak, as they have dug in elsewhere in California. They have purchased lots,—ludicrously designated as "garden farms"—at prices ranging from \$200 to \$375, with a few dollars down and a few dollars a month. Largely by their own labor they have built shelters. The progression in the type of shelter follows the characteristic pattern: first, tents and trailers; second, shacks or shanties; and, finally, the small one-, two-, or three-room house. Here, as elsewhere in California, the form that the settlement has taken is an eloquent tribute to the ingenuity and the resourcefulness of the people involved. They have, for example, improvised shelters out of the most miscellaneous materials. Wholly unplanned and undirected, the new Bell Gardens exists in Los Angeles today as a result of the necessity of its inhabitants and the indifference of the larger community of which it is a part. Needless to say, although the residents of Los Angeles proper do not seem to be aware of the fact, they have a new problem child on their doorstep. Garvey Acres, near El Monte, is a similar community, but, unlike Bell Gardens, where water is available from a private water company, water is not available through regular connections and the squatters have had to dig shallow wells equipped with pitcher pumps. And this quaint anachronism, mind you, exists in the heart of metropolitan Los Angeles.

The rural settlements, all squatter-like in character, are scattered throughout the San Joaquin Valley. These settlements naturally vary somewhat from community to community, depending upon whether they belong to the vintage of 1934 or that of 1939. Most of these migrant settlements, or Little Oklahomas, have come into existence since 1934. Here, again, the progression follows the usual pattern: tents, trailers, shacks, and finally, one- and two-room frame shanties. Many of these communities in the San Joaquin Valley have sprung into existence in the most unlikely localities, both with respect to employment opportunities and with respect to soil conditions. Many of them are located on wholly unproductive land. In many instances the settlers or squatters have had to purchase a share of stock in a water company to get water on the premises, and the price of the stock is frequently the equivalent of, or in excess of, the price of the lot. Lots which agricultural commissioners have stated were not conceivably worth more than \$50 have been sold in

certain localities for \$250 and \$300. Many migrant families have not even achieved the elevated status of residence in a one-room frame shack located on hard-pan. These unsettled migrants can be found in private labor camps, cheap auto and trailer camps, and a dwindling number of roadside squatter camps. The Hoovervilles of 1931 and 1932 were bad enough, but they had about them something of the unreality and impermanence of a movie set. These new migrant communities are permanent settlements.

All of these migrant settlements, rural and urban, have certain characteristics in common. They are invariably to be found in unincorporated portions of the counties in which they are located and this fact may well serve as a social symbol. The migrants, in other words, are not part of the incorporated settlement or the established community. These new communities—crude, raw, and shapeless—impinge upon older settlements in California. This circumstance implies, and the facts justify the inference, social cleavage between the two settlements: Little Oklahoma, on the one hand, and the pretentious urbanism of the typical California city-town, on the other hand. The migrant community is usually on the outskirts of the older community and attached to it as a kind of unwanted appendage. This cleavage is so sharply defined that it can be said to involve an element of conscious segregation.

Another characteristic that these settlements have in common is the unplanned, and highly makeshift, character of the settlement itself. Your typical migrant settlement is unplanned with respect to employment opportunities, unplanned with respect to the future development of the region in which it is located, unplanned with respect to a proper utilization of land and natural resources, unplanned with respect to the type and character of construction, unplanned with respect to the extension to the community of existing social and governmental services. That these settlements have a degree of orderliness about them is a tribute to the character of the migrants, and, at the same time, a damning indictment of the social anarchy, political impotence, and community lethargy that forced these people to shift for themselves in the corners, backyards, and margins of the state. While these new settlements are not bad, considering the circumstances, they constitute potential slums. When foreign immigrants rushed into Eastern industrial centers at the beginning of this century, they settled in much the same fashion; and they, like the migrants, were forced to create the slum areas which today we are endeavoring to eliminate at considerable public expense. In other words, we have permitted the pattern of rural slum areas to come into existence in California.

One highly unfortunate aspect of the entire problem is, of course, that it is much easier to direct a resettlement movement when it is in a fluid state, so to speak, than it is to uproot people once they have squatted. An extremely complicated pattern of petty vested interests has now come into existence. The owners of these shack-town equities must now be dealt

with, if you please, as property owners; we have permitted them to create a myriad small-scale vested interests. We have, also, permitted another type of vested interest to come into existence. Some of our financial institutions and our large land companies were quick to realize that they might capitalize on the migrant problem and sell at good prices land which, because of its location or lack of productive capacity, they had never dreamed could be disposed of at a profit. They have created a number of these cheap subdivisions; they have made it possible for migrants to settle in the most unlikely localities; and they will naturally oppose any governmental attempt to cope with this problem on a large scale.

Our failure to cope with the migrant problem is all the more inexcusable in view of our past familiarity with the issues involved. The problem of land settlement is an old problem in California. The problem presented by the growth of improperly located, improperly planned, mushroom communities dates from 1880 in Southern California. More than one ghost subdivision is to be found in Los Angeles and San Diego counties today. It is rather ironic to pick up a copy of the *Report on Land Colonization and Rural Credits*, issued in 1916, and to realize how completely we have forgotten the mistakes of the past. In that far-off halcyon period when mass migration to California was being encouraged by every resource that could be devised, the new settler was greeted with that cordiality for which California realtors have become famous; and at least some attempt was made, by the development associations, to supply a certain amount of readily available information with respect to likely sites for settlement. The only information that we have given these latter-day migrants is that residence requirements for relief have been increased and that there are no jobs in California.

One major difficulty in California has been the defensive attitude of the local communities. Every proposal for the resettlement of migrants in this state draws forth the inevitable comment that "anything you do for these people will only encourage more to come." This type of reasoning leads, of course, to strange conclusions. If meeting human needs is to be avoided for fear of encouraging further migration, then logically we should take still further steps to make it extremely unpleasant for the migrants already in the state. One is reminded, in this connection, of Dean Swift's proposal to end the famine in Ireland by roasting the babies. Actually, of course, we don't want the migrants to starve; so we keep them alive; but like people plagued with unwanted relatives, we ask every now and then when they intend to return to the Dust Bowl. The technique, in family relations, for handling dependent relatives, is to keep them moving, from brother to sister, from aunt to uncle. This technique finds reflection in a statement made on February 21, 1940, by James Beebe, a former president of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce: "With regard to relief, I am convinced that California should not be called upon

to make permanent provision for all of its migrant population. It is a false kindness to these people to keep them in conditions where they have no chance of employment and where their initiative will be ultimately sapped. In other periods, the United States has had this problem to solve and has answered it by keeping unemployed people moving from community to community until they found their place in society and again became independent." I can only trust that Mr. Beebe was able to make this statement with a straight face.

Another reason why we have failed to work out a decent approach to this problem might be mentioned. We have in California our own "peculiar institution," namely, our system of migratory farm labor which is, of course, merely a reflex of our highly industrialized agricultural economy. We are almost as sensitive about this issue as Southerners used to be about chattel slavery. There are, of course, many flaws in the comparison, but, in general, it is sound. We fly into attitudes of belligerent hostility when our peculiar institution is investigated or probed and these attitudes, unfortunately, have become almost ceremonial. Any plan for the resettlement of migrants in California, no matter how cautiously it is phrased or how tentatively it is advanced, sooner or later—and generally quite soon indeed—collides with the basic realities of our industrialized agriculture and the moment this collision occurs, planning beats a hasty retreat. Governor Olson endeavored to plan for the settlement of migrants. He appointed a Commission on Reemployment, made up of some extremely able men, real social planners. Their report was issued on September 30, 1939, but no single provision of the plan recommended by the Commission is in effect today. There is an area in which planning or discussion is permissible, but it exists, so to speak, around the circumference of the problem. We are permitted to plan, and are even given some small degree of encouragement to make plans, so long as the planning is devoted to ways and means of making the existing system of migratory farm labor function more effectively than it has in the past. But any plan which has as its objective the decasualization of migratory workers runs counter to the existing *mores* and is instantly condemned. Most social planners in California have, therefore, long since concluded that in so far as working out a plan for the decasualization of migratory labor is concerned, they had better busy themselves with the intricacies of urban traffic.

As indicating the limits of permissible planning for the resettlement of migrants, I would refer to a report entitled: *Migrants: A National Problem and Its Impact on California*, issued in May 1940 by the California State Chamber of Commerce. In general the committee of the State Chamber of Commerce is to be commended for the attitude reflected in the report; the report, moreover, contains much valuable and pertinent information. But the conclusions drawn by the committee are somewhat disappointing. The committee apparently felt that the problem is not

one of resettling migrants in California, but of relocating migrants in Oklahoma. California, in other words, takes cognizance of the problem but graciously suggests that "efforts should be made to provide opportunity for some of the migrants to return to agriculture in other states, preferably those from which they originally migrated." On the question of whether this suggestion is feasible or not, the report states: "Whether lands are available suitably located and of a quality adequate for such a program is a matter that can only be ascertained by study in the states of origin." Yet, in an earlier section of the report, the committee took notice of the fact that there has been a rapid trend toward mechanization in Texas and Oklahoma, resulting in extensive displacement of sharecroppers, tenants, and farm workers. The balance of the recommendations for the most part are devoted to ways and means to make our migratory labor system function more efficiently.

Planning for the resettlement of migrants in the West, those now here and those to come, gives rise to a whole series of problems. It would be impossible, of course, to outline in this paper even the major issues involved. But I have been struck by the fact, as pointed out recently by T. J. Wooster, that most of the current thinking on this problem seems to be strongly influenced by the type of assumptions that are made with respect to whether or not existing patterns are generally to be followed. This assumption, in turn, is governed by what conclusions are drawn with respect to the changes of far-reaching magnitude now taking place in agriculture.

The effect of these assumptions upon the matter of administrative policies is quite apparent. It is the policy of the Reclamation Bureau, to take an example at random, to attempt to insure a small-scale settlement on its projects. This policy assumes, it seems to me, that the pattern of the family-sized farm in agriculture is one that can be expected to survive. Yet the experience of the Reclamation Bureau, at least in Arizona, would seem to throw some doubt upon the validity of this assumption. Nor is this, by any means, an academic issue. It has important implications in so far as planning is concerned for the resettlement of migrants on lands to be brought under cultivation in connection with Grand Coulee, the East Mesa District in Imperial Valley, and the Central Valley project. Whether this excess-lands provision is to be followed on the Central Valley project will certainly have an important bearing upon the type of resettlement projects that might be planned, and their feasibility.

Or, to take another example, consider the resettlement program of the Farm Security Administration. At present greater emphasis seems to be placed upon projects of the "infiltration" type, rather than upon the development of new rural communities. Should migrants be resettled on large-scale cooperative farming projects of the type established by the FSA at Casa Grande and Chandler, Arizona, or should they be scattered about, in existing farm communities, on the infiltration theory? If you assume

that resettlement must follow existing patterns, then obviously the infiltration theory will be accepted. Yet, after reading Walter Packard's brilliant testimony before the LaFollette Committee, I cannot escape the conclusion that, although the initial costs per family may be greater, the large-scale cooperative farm idea holds out the greater promise of success, particularly in California.

If you assume that existing patterns of subdividing land must be continued, then the development of such communities as Bell Gardens and Garvey Acres is inevitable under present circumstances. But if you assume that such is not the case, then other possibilities of resettlement immediately occur to mind. We have, for example, on the statute books in California the Community Land Chest Act. Although this act has been on the statute books since 1933, not a single corporation, so far as I know, has been formed under its provisions. If you assume that the existing patterns of handling tax-delinquent land must be followed, then, naturally, you continue to hold such land for redemption or possible sale. But that this assumption is by no means valid is indicated, I believe, by reference to an act passed by the state of Arkansas on March 16, 1939, designed to make tax-delinquent lands available for resettlement purposes. If you assume that delinquent lands in irrigation districts can only be administered as they have been in the past, then naturally bondholders will not be paid, land companies will defraud the district of revenue, and productive lands will not be available for resettlement purposes. But if you assume that irrigation districts need not follow this pattern, then the irrigation districts themselves might be used as excellent instrumentalities through which to effect a resettlement program, a possibility which to date has not even been explored. If you assume that the pattern of community development which has been followed in the past must necessarily be followed in the future, then there is little real planning that can be undertaken to eliminate shack-towns in California. But if you do not share this assumption—all too prevalent in California today—then you naturally think in terms of creating a state housing authority. Thus, even the matter of the instrumentalities to be utilized for resettlement purposes is strongly influenced by assumptions of the type that I have indicated.

No considerations, however politic, should dissuade us today from examining these, and similar assumptions, in a sharp, critical light. Agriculture today is in the midst of an industrial revolution; as our College of Agriculture in California recently announced, the robots are moving into the field. Intense pressures are at work in agriculture: the pressure of population upon resources; the pressure of farm debt; the crushing impact of the weight of our entire industrial mechanism upon our agricultural economy. Those planning for resettlement of migrants can only ignore these considerations at the risk of failure. The scope that we have given to our thinking on this question is too narrow and too restricted.

We need, for example, to reconsider what we mean by "resettlement." It was perhaps inevitable that the first efforts to cope with this great problem of migration caused by displacement should have taken the form of "rehabilitation" and "resettlement" programs. We were, in effect, encountering the problem on the edges of acute distress and losing sight, to some extent, of the larger question, namely, of what happens when agriculture becomes geared to the dictates of finance in a profit economy. Today, thanks in large measure to the testimony which was presented at the reopening of the LaFollette Committee in Washington in May, and to the work of the Temporary National Economic Committee, we realize that these methods are inadequate. It is not, perhaps, so much a resettlement of our distressed rural population that we need as it is a basic reconstruction of our economy. We have gone, perhaps, as far as it is possible to go in improvising programs to meet immediate situations; in other words, as Mr. Woofter recently observed, "rational planning must supplant emergency psychosis." Resettlement, moreover, is developing a dual aspect: We are urged to settle the industrial unemployed upon part-time farms; at the same time, we are urged to adopt the same program for the agricultural unemployed. Can it be seriously contended, for example, that we can solve the problem of intermittent employment in industry and in agriculture, with its resulting insecurity and inadequacy of earning-power, by settling eight or ten million people on part-time subsistence homesteads? This type of planning, it seems to me, accepts at face value the major assumptions made by the apologists for our existing industrial order, namely, that employment must necessarily be intermittent in industry and that employment in agriculture must be necessarily insecure. This type of approach is tantamount to building hostels for the victims of a system, while the maladjustments worked by the system itself are permitted to continue without abatement. The hostels may be quite all right in themselves, but it is the system that needs overhauling. We are told, from still another quarter, that we should resettle, that is, decentralize industry. The implication of this statement seems to be that what is needed to make our industrial order function efficiently is merely to relocate population and resettle industrial sites. Here, again, reconstruction, rather than resettlement, is indicated; or, to phrase it differently, resettlement without reconstruction is not enough.

If we refuse to accept the more restrictive of these current assumptions, then we must realize that the possibilities of resettlement in the West have scarcely been explored, much less exhausted. Our defensive attitude toward migration is based primarily on a set of assumptions which we accept at face value; the attitudes, for example, that I have described, are the product of this type of thinking. Migration does not necessarily increase the ratio of unemployed to employed; the per capita distribution of income is actually increasing in the states that have shown a net increase in population through migration. We can absorb a much larger

influx than we have already unwillingly received, provided, however, that we plan intelligently and that we can win for planning thought and technique a much wider scope than, up to the present, has been permitted. We must remember, also, as I have endeavored to indicate, that dynamic factors are at work in American agriculture today. We must plan in relation to these changing circumstances and the degree of success that can be achieved will be influenced by our appraisal of these factors. The time-tables of social change have been accelerated; we must plan not only to meet the immediate needs of today, but in terms, also, of the reconstruction of tomorrow.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

REPORTER: Harry D. Freeman, *City Planning Engineer, Portland.*

DISCUSSION LEADERS: Roy F. Bessey, *Counselor, Region IX, National Resources Planning Board.*

Walter A. Duffy, *Regional Director, Farm Security Administration.*

William E. Warne, *Director of Information, Bureau of Reclamation.*

In opening the discussion on migration and resettlement, Mr. Bessey pointed out that Mr. McWilliams' suggestions for a fundamental, planning and reconstructive approach toward solution of migration and resettlement problems "should have widest and most careful consideration." Mr. Bessey stressed the need for "parallel provision for economic opportunity" in industry and agriculture as a corollary to the provision for resettlement and agreed with Mr. McWilliams that "a rational decentralization of industry is an indispensable part of the solution." He emphasized the need for a consideration of social and economic factors as well as military factors in any immediate program of industrial relocation.

In speaking of the shift of public thought to the national security problem, Mr. Bessey stated that problems such as the migration and resettlement of the people should not be overlooked. He pointed out that "the solutions of the problem of defense may quite generally be in harmony with those of the problem of migration and resettlement," and that "we cannot have a truly secure nation with millions in various parts of the country in the highly insecure migrant or stranded status. We should look for solutions best adapted to both emergency and normal conditions."

Various surveys by the former Oregon State Planning Board, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and the Farm Security Administration

indicate, asserted Mr. Bessey, that about half a million people migrated into the Pacific Northwest between 1929 and 1939.

Mr. Bessey cited the study of the Pacific Northwest Regional Planning Commission which is examining the land and migration problems in the Pacific Northwest area with a view toward the more effective coordination of state and federal activities. He epitomized as follows the views of the Commission at the conclusion of the first phase of its study:

"The Pacific Northwest still has some of the aspects of the frontier—with respect to the development of its resources of land, water, and minerals, for example . . . While its population is approaching stability from the standpoint of reproduction, it is still increasing at a considerable rate through migration. The region is also less mature from the standpoint of industrial development.

"The new westward wave of migration, rising notably after 1934, has greatly intensified the need for expanding economic opportunity in the Pacific Northwest. While the recent influx is by no means the greatest that the region has experienced, and while it brings with it opportunities for expanding the economic life of the region, the problems of economic assimilation are different and in many respects far more difficult than they have been heretofore. If basic economic opportunity is provided, the newcomers (with a majority in the most productive period of life) are distinctly an asset to the region. If economic opportunity is not developed, the result may well be generally declining standards of living."

Recommendations made as a result of the preliminary findings of the study are summarized under the following eight points:

"(1) That federal agencies, states, and counties recognize the need for rehabilitating migrant families on good lands and whenever practicable turn work relief expenditures toward projects which will create permanent economic opportunity.

"(2) That the federal government recognize the desirability of the population redistribution now in progress and by appropriate legislation extend certain minimum social services that the states cannot supply to nonresidents that are needy and in distress.

"(3) That the Farm Security Administration's present program to provide camps for migratory farm labor be developed as rapidly as possible so that the migratory farm labor families in the states of the Pacific Coast and of the Pacific Northwest may have available sanitary living conditions on their circuits; that these camps, or similar camps constructed by other public and private agencies, be increased in areas where facilities are not now adequate to meet the needs of migratory groups seasonally employed.

"(4) That a program for the medical care of all low-income farm groups be developed through the cooperation of state medical groups, health agencies and the federal government, that local and state health

authorities be provided with more adequate staffs to maintain reasonable sanitary standards both in the interests of protecting the migratory group and of shielding the local community from communicable diseases.

"(5) That state employment services give continued attention to the improvement and dissemination of information regarding demand for seasonal agricultural labor in order to counteract exaggerated advertising of employment opportunities and to reduce as far as possible the futile wandering of these people in their search for work.

"(6) That suitable machinery be set up to provide realistic information concerning conditions in Pacific Northwest agriculture to any who may contemplate moving there.

"(7) That the United States Department of Agriculture and the state extension services be equipped with the staff necessary to provide increased services to settlers in their search for good lands in the Pacific Northwest and to aid settlers in learning how to adapt their previous farm experience to Pacific Northwest conditions.

"(8) That the regional agricultural laboratories of the Department of Agriculture give special attention to the possibility of developing new small community industries based on surplus, low-grade and waste agricultural commodities; that other interested groups, private and public, give attention to such industries which might provide off-season employment to agricultural labor."

Another conclusion from the regional study was that long-term solution of the problems of population shift and change must be sought in the expansion of economic opportunity through the development of feasibly reclaimable lands, and the filling of marked gaps in industrial and manufacturing activity.

Mr. Bessey then cited the work of Grand Coulee and other similar projects, large and small, in providing for new or more intensive land use and power facilities as "an essential factor in widened industrial development." He also pointed to the plans and programs of the state of Montana as "a particularly important example of realistic public action striking toward the core of such problems."

In closing Mr. Bessey emphasized once again the necessity of coordinating the long-term need of aid in the reorienting and retraining of the migrant and stranded peoples with the immediate needs of the national defense program; he reiterated his belief that "with foresight and cooperation the demands of the immediate and the long-term, the military and the social, may quite generally be harmonized."

Mr. Duffy cited the Yakima Valley in Washington as another example of what is happening in mushroom settlements where stranded people seek shelter and work in congested labor markets. In this valley, 33,000 workers are used at the height of the harvest season and this demand is reduced to 500 in December. Between 4,000 and 6,000 workers live in the

valley the year round and about half of the resident families earn less than \$200 per year and only one-fourth earn more than \$400 per year.

Mr. Duffy emphasized the lack of adequate income of migratory and resident laborers and the public expense in taking care of them. The Vale-Owyhee reclamation project in East Central Oregon, where the Farm Security Administration was called upon to aid settlers, was cited to illustrate the point. An investigation of the 1,100 families located there largely since 1935, showed:

1. Families received very little medical attention and are unable to pay for such services. There were 216 families owing about \$10,000 for medical services. Today doctors require cash in advance.

2. Housing facilities are poor. Over half the houses cost less than \$200 each. The dirt floors of some of them, and lack of medical attention, have bred disease.

3. Forty per cent of the families must haul water for a distance of five miles in some cases.

Mr. Duffy pictured the plight of the farmer who, under such conditions, wanted to accumulate money for investment in better living conditions for his family.

After study of migration into the Pacific Northwest in 1936 and 1937, Mr. Duffy concluded that the problem of migration and resettlement was national in scope and that any effective program must be projected on a national basis.

In 1939, the Farm Security Administration and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics found that 465,000 persons moved into Oregon, Washington and Idaho from 1930 to 1939. About 40 per cent of these were farmers and farm laborers who had the least success of any occupational group.

The Farm Security Administration made loans and grants of about 135 million dollars to 400,000 families in the six Great Plains states in an effort to keep them at home. In fact, the main effort of the Farm Security Administration has been to check migration at its source. For every dollar used by the Farm Security Administration to aid migrants in California, it has spent \$20 to rehabilitate families in the states from which the bulk of Pacific Coast migrants come.

Mr. Duffy said that economists of the United States Department of Agriculture have concluded that farm machinery will remove more than two million farmers from the land in ten years. This means that about "one out of twelve farm operators in the United States will be put on the road in that period."

The mechanization of agriculture, concentration of ownership, soil depletion, the "Go West" tradition, and drouths, have produced the problem of migration.

Mr. Duffy stated that, although the problem was national, the states

should not be without responsibility and should face the facts as indicated by Mr. McWilliams. "Legal settlement" laws of various states were criticized as promoting dodging tactics in public administration. Uniform state laws, with provision for federal aid, were suggested. Mr. Duffy then suggested increased income and inheritance taxes to meet the cost of adequate programs. He stated that the possibilities of a graduated land tax should be explored.

Mr. Duffy stressed the need for honest experimentation and action as opposed to "waiting for panzer divisions and stukas to blast us out of a lethargy of the past traditions and mores in settlement policy with a resultant horde of refugees for society to care for."

Mr. Warne, in his discussion of Mr. McWilliams' paper "fenced off the small field in which the Bureau of Reclamation works." He stated that it would be disappointing if this conference discussed migration without developing practical ideas.

At the outset it was stated that the Bureau of Reclamation could provide new opportunities for only a fraction of those who have moved to the West.

Mr. Warne said the Bureau can participate in resettlement in two ways: (1) by construction of water conservation projects in the Great Plains, thereby promoting stability of population at the source of migration; and (2) by making available new irrigated land on projects now being constructed for settlement in the eleven Western states.

Mr. Warne emphasized that reclamation projects must be considered as part of a long-time program, that they cannot be accomplished overnight.

In regard to Mr. McWilliams' statements on a new agricultural order, Mr. Warne said that "it might be as erroneous to conclude at this time that the family-size farm should be abandoned as an objective in all areas, as to proceed on the theory that the family-size farm can be maintained in all areas." He stated that the family-size farm on irrigated land in Arizona appeared to be breaking down under the strain of competition with industrialized agriculture, but that in Idaho, no similar breakdown on federal projects of similar age has been experienced, and "even in Arizona there are a large number and a high proportion of family-size farms operating successfully on irrigated land today."

Mr. Warne pointed out that there was some reason to believe the principal advantage of industrialized farming, on irrigated land at least, lies in the marketing end of the business. He said that the greatest headway had been made in the areas producing speculative crops of perishables such as lettuce and melons, but he also pointed out that powerful co-operative marketing organizations protect the family-size farms to some extent in areas producing crops almost as perishable and speculative. Although mechanization is an attribute of industrialized agriculture, the small all-purpose tractor offers a similar opportunity for mechanization

to the family-size farm, and in the irrigation of land the lack of machinery to tend irrigation water gives the advantage to the family-size farm.

An important observation was that family-size farms were not equal in area in all circumstances, that they may vary from 10 acres—or less on intensely cultivated irrigated land—to 3,000 acres—or more on dry-farmed land in the wheat belt. Also, the 160 acre Homestead Law was not practical in the semi-arid and arid lands in the West; to this may be traced some of the adjustments bearing on recent migrations.

The family-size farm should not be abandoned on pure reasoning alone, but the decision should rest on experience. It must also be remembered, Mr. Warne declared, that Congress has adopted the ideal of family-size farms in its basic legislation; this ideal has often been re-emphasized, and could not be changed except by specific congressional action. The Columbia Basin project which is as large in area as the state of Delaware, was suggested as a proving ground for present theories.

Recognizing the complexity of resettlement for this area the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation produced the Plan of Joint Investigation for the Columbia Basin Irrigation Project, under the direction of Dr. Harlan H. Barrows of the University of Chicago. The twenty-eight problems of the Joint Investigation are all directed toward the optimum use of the land and range in complexity from planning for the ornamental plantings around farmsteads to the planning of new towns. More than forty agencies, governmental and private, and individuals are participating in the investigations on a cooperative basis. Gradually, said Mr. Warne, the interrelationships of the various problems are being worked out; the jig-saw pieces are being fitted into place, and eventually the complete picture will be obtainable.

Mr. Warne said the Joint Investigation bears only indirectly on the immediate problem of settlement of migrants; however, the Columbia Basin lands make possible these valuable studies and will, in time, provide homes for thousands of migrant families of the type we have been discussing here.

To summarize, the speaker and the discussers were in agreement on (1) the need for extensive investigation and experience in resettlement; (2) the need for checking the flow of migrants at the source; (3) the national aspect of the problem of migration; (4) the need of sound planning for a directed resettlement.

Highways and Transportation in Relation to Each Other and to Other Planned Development

PRELIMINARY REPORT OF THE HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION
COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF PLANNING OFFICIALS

I. S. SHATTUCK, Chairman—*Planning and Traffic Consultant, Oakland.*

HARRY F. AUMACK, *Engineer, City Planning Commission, Spokane.*

BURTON W. MARSH, *Director, Safety and Traffic Engineering Department, American Automobile Association, Washington.*

D. GRANT MICKLE, *Traffic and Safety Engineer, Michigan State Highway Department, Lansing.*

LADISLAS SEGOE, *Planning Consultant, Cincinnati.*

INTRODUCTION

Past highway and transport policies and effect on development: The rational, long-range development of our highway system, whether for the nation or the urban region, is but a part of the larger problem of developing a properly coordinated and balanced system of transport facilities of all types in which each is to function within its respective sphere of economic utility and each be in scale with the present and potential demand for the particular type of service. A long-range program of highway development for the nation must needs be integrated with and be a part of a comprehensive national transportation plan embracing all types of transport—water, rail, highway, air, and pipe line. Likewise a plan for an ultimate major street and highway system for an urban area, to be sound, must be part of a comprehensive local transportation plan, in which highways are integrated with transit, rail, water, and air transport, and their terminal facilities and operations. All of this must be attuned to desirable community development.

The policy of providing new or improved transport facilities, or offering lower transportation rates to communities or regions already best provided with such facilities, was the policy which private enterprise followed in building our canals, turnpikes, and railroads. The extreme con-

centration of population and manufacturers in relatively small areas,¹ which is regarded by some as unsound or undesirable for the economic and social well-being of the nation and now from the standpoint of national defense as well, is largely attributable to these policies. While new forms of transport and successive advancement in transport technology created increased possibilities for the diffusion of urbanization, population, and economic activities, the policies and practices pursued by private enterprise in respect to both the providing of facilities and the fixing of charges operated to encourage concentration.

Similar but even more conspicuous is the typical pattern of our larger cities, with their small intensively-developed central areas and their far-flung, sparsely settled suburbs, likewise due in considerable measure to much the same policies in building turnpikes and providing transit facilities. Any plan for a more adequate city and suburban traffic, transit, and transportation system should, in addition to meeting present and anticipated traffic needs, aim to further a better balanced urban pattern, more economical to build, maintain and operate.

Bureau of public roads' report, "Toll Roads and Free Roads": Recently, proposals for the provision of new and better highways have seemed to take precedence over all other transportation considerations. The United States Congress, partly because of conviction in some quarters that a national network of modern "superhighways" would prove economically feasible on a toll basis, directed the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads to investigate and report on the feasibility of such a toll system.² The resulting report, "Toll Roads and Free Roads," published early in 1939, is a milestone in highway planning progress. The Bureau of Public Roads reported not only on the proposed system of toll superhighways, which it found infeasible from an economic standpoint, but also on the necessity of a comprehensive system of free highways for the nation. This report presented a proposed system, with recommended design and construction standards, and discussed highway planning and construction problems of first importance in carrying out any comprehensive scheme of highway development.

Formation of ASPO committee on highways and transportation: This report and the American Society of Planning Officials's keen interest in the proper consideration of, and planning for, highway and transportation facilities led to the appointment of this committee by ASPO. The committee, composed of planners and traffic engineers, was charged with the duty of considering the whole subject of highways and transportation in and around cities, and the function, location, and design of such facilities

¹ One-half of the population of the country was located in 189 counties in 1930; at least one-fifth in the metropolitan areas of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, and Los Angeles; one-seventh of 1 per cent of the total U. S. land area contained 43.8 per cent of all wage jobs in 1929, and two-thirds of the factory jobs were contained in an area only 5 per cent of the nation's total.

² Section 13 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1938.

with relation to each other and with relation to other planned development. It was further charged with the duty of reporting on this subject at this National Conference on Planning.

Outstanding features of the report, "Toll Roads and Free Roads": The Bureau of Public Roads' report, "Toll Roads and Free Roads," is undoubtedly one of the most important contributions to highway planning that has ever been made. Its comprehensive nature is due primarily to availability of data from the various state-wide highway planning surveys which have been conducted with such intelligence and farsightedness under the able direction of the Bureau of Public Roads and with the cooperation of state highway authorities. If similar data had been available ten or fifteen years ago many of the errors in planning, design and construction could have been prevented. It is encouraging that the Bureau of Public Roads and state highway authorities are availing themselves of the data now at hand in developing the many miles of street and highway systems which are even today inadequate and obsolete.

It is well to have a factual report evaluating the proposal for toll roads. The constructive value of the report, however, lies in its proposal for a national system of free interregional highways and its intelligent exposition of the many considerations and problems involved in the planning and development of such a system. The report has many excellent and interesting features, chief of which is the conclusion that the highway problem in and around cities demands first attention of federal and state highway authorities, thus confirming the view which many of us have long held. Others are:

1. The various data from the highway planning surveys and their analyses.
2. The estimates of probable usage and revenues of a toll system and the conclusion that a system of toll highways will not be feasible from a revenue standpoint and will not solve the highway transportation problem of the United States.
3. The conclusion that urban areas (except the smaller ones) cannot be by-passed, since they are the major sources and destination points of highway traffic and since relatively short haul movements are in the majority.
4. The suggestion that highway plans be considered in the planning of low-cost housing projects.
5. The recognition of the need of highway protection.
 - a. By controlling use of and access to abutting property.
 - b. By adequate design of the highway itself, such as sufficient width of right-of-way, provision of service streets for local traffic and parking, etc.
6. The discussion of the need for the exercise of excess condemnation for protective design, and the need for legal liberalization of the term "public use" as applied to excess condemnation.

7. Advocacy of the principle of "recoupment taking" of land (taking for profit) in excess of that needed directly for highway purposes.
8. The 26,700-mile master highway plan, proposed for establishment by law as the primary highway system of the United States.
9. The high standards of design and construction recommended for this system.
10. Recommendation that a Federal Land Authority be established and that such an authority be empowered to secure land in advance of construction of federal, state and local projects and to hold it and lease it to the governmental bodies as needed.

"Toll Roads and Free Roads" is broad in point of concept and in understanding of problems relating to future development of highways, but of necessity the report had to hew to the line more or less and could not address itself to related types of transportation and general community development. It is quite natural, therefore, that planners and traffic engineers, operating in the urban areas on which the attention of highway authorities is now focused, should undertake a study of all the transportation and planning considerations that are involved.

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

The Highways and Transportation Committee is presenting a preliminary report only at this time. The complexity and broad scope of the assigned subject and the necessity for a certain amount of research and a careful study of all the factors involved in the highway and transportation problem are the chief reasons for this decision. It is hoped that the committee will be given authority and means to continue its study and prepare a final report during the following year.

In this report preliminary findings are presented, consisting of fundamental considerations in the planning of highway and transportation facilities in and around cities, both in relation to each other and to other planned development. They are not necessarily conclusive, but it is hoped that they will stimulate serious thought and study on the part of planners and traffic engineers and the various public agencies concerned with highway and transportation matters and planning in general.

These preliminary findings follow:

I

THAT NO MAJOR HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT SHOULD BE UNDERTAKEN EXCEPT AS A PART OF A COMPREHENSIVE LONG-TERM PLAN OF A MAJOR STREET HIGHWAY SYSTEM OF THE ENTIRE URBAN AREA OR REGION, WHICH IN TURN SHOULD BE DERIVED THROUGH STUDIES AND BE AN INTEGRAL PART OF A BROADER PLAN OF TRANS-

PORTATION FACILITIES—LOCAL, SUBURBAN, AND LONG DISTANCE
—INCLUDING ALL FORMS OF TRANSPORT FOR THE ENTIRE URBAN
AREA OR REGION.

Local plan of major highways must be prepared: Except in small cities, traffic on highways in and around urban areas is predominantly of local origin and destination, and the problem of providing more adequate facilities for handling this traffic, is, therefore, predominantly a local problem. It should be remembered also that the local legislative body will have much to say about the type, location, extent, and cost of any proposed highway project. The relative need for such projects can only be determined by reference to a major highway plan showing all highways, present and future, of major importance.

Public transit cannot be ignored: Proper planning and construction of traffic-ways, and the control of the development of the community through the application of sound principles of city planning simplify, to a certain extent, the task of providing for traffic. Yet the present complexity of traffic composition and movement creates a new and important need for street appurtenance and regulation, or a need for traffic planning. As population density increases, the use of the private automobile as a means of individual transportation decreases. In any community the extent to which the motor vehicle fills all of the transportation requirements is dependent upon economic considerations and personal convenience. In the light of low ratios of persons per automobile⁸ it appears that the economic factor has not been given adequate consideration in comparison, for instance, with the factor of individual convenience. When flexibility and speed as potential advantages of individual transportation diminish, the resulting condition of congestion discourages further use of the automobile, and population turns to other means such as are provided by the bus, street car or rapid transit.

The central sections of cities have been the scenes of concentrated commercial activities. These activities have attracted greater and greater usage of street facilities within and directly contiguous to them. Centralization has been desirable because it brings in close contact related activities, thus limiting the cost of conducting business. Short distances between offices and stores in the commercial section are analogous to the conveyor lines in our industrial plants. Centralization has kept overhead low. Centralization, however, has made it less possible and more costly to provide additional facilities for street traffic, while at the same time it has increased the demand for them. The tendency toward universal adoption of individual transportation has aggravated rather than improved the situation, and decentralization has often resulted. As a result of decentralization, businesses are scattered, overhead is increased, and the need

⁸ There is little variation in average automobile occupancy throughout the nation. In round figures this average is 1.7 persons per automobile.

for the transportation of persons between points at greater distances not only spreads congestion but is responsible for an increase in the total passenger miles travelled. This additional overhead cost, due to decentralization, must be added to that of congestion and accidents in order to arrive at a measure of the price we pay for our present composition of community travel.

Therefore, it is essential that in planning for the movement of persons and goods within metropolitan areas consideration be given to both individual and mass transportation.

Freight and passenger terminals must be considered: Plans for highway facilities must also recognize the relationship between highway locations and present and probable future locations of local and long distance freight and passenger terminals, also anticipated changes in methods of freight handling. The only way this can be done is through the medium of a comprehensive plan, geared to requirements of each type of transportation in terms of relative public service performed by each, and including future adjustments necessary for an efficient interchange of persons and goods from one form of transportation to the other.

II

THAT THE LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN SHOULD—IN ADDITION TO MEETING PRESENT AND ANTICIPATED NEEDS—BE IN ACCORD WITH THE MASTER PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT OF THE COMMUNITY AND REGION.

Interrelationship between highways and transportation, and community development: The long-range transportation plan should be designed to further a community structure and pattern, such distribution of land uses, population, economic and social activities as will tend to minimize waste, conflict, danger and strain, and as will enhance the efficiency, convenience, amenities, and general satisfactions of urban living. The coordinated transport plan for the city or urban region, the long-range plan of highway facilities, and the highway improvements to be built thereunder are most likely to contribute towards such betterment of general community development if they are conceived of and evolved as organic features of comprehensive, long-range community plans, or master plans.

There are so many interrelationships between the various features of the master plan that a full discussion is not possible. Furthermore, relatively few communities have master plans, combining all the elements of community development that properly should be included. The committee finds that the principal reason for this is inability of local planning agencies to obtain the means and the necessary support for such comprehensive planning, and, as pointed out later on in this report, such support

in the way of adequate staff and funds as well as cooperation and assistance by governmental agencies responsible for the carrying out of public projects is urgently needed. Another reason is that over-all planning is usually lost sight of in the promotion and public acceptance of isolated projects; superhighways, low-cost housing, public buildings, recreation facilities, etc.

Expediency, not planning, has guided public projects: Local governmental agencies, in the recent scramble to obtain federal assistance on projects through PWA, WPA, etc., appointed planning bodies without funds, or used existing inactive planning bodies to enable them to satisfy federal requirements for approval of projects by local planning agencies.

There are instances when public housing projects have been located on main highways principally because of the advertising value of the locations—more people will see them.

Numerous other examples could be cited, but they are too well known to require mention.

Relation between highway and public housing projects: In "Toll Roads and Free Roads" it is pointed out that "there is growing danger that these . . . developments by the Government in its slum-clearance projects, will block the logical projection of the needed new arteries into the city center." The conclusion arrived at is that "since the actual accomplishment of such (highway) projects will at best require time they should now be planned in order that their eventual courses may not be barred by newly created property."

This statement on the part of federal highway authorities is encouraging, but the planning of a system of highways is not the complete answer; in considering the effects of highway and housing projects on each other it becomes apparent that housing projects, indeed the rehabilitation of entire blighted districts, should be planned. This is not the responsibility of highway authorities, but of local planning agencies.

Housing and highway projects might not only interfere with each other; they might seriously impair or enhance the value of each other, as the case may be, as follows: (1) The highway may slice through a logical neighborhood unit type of housing project, thus destroying its potential unity. (2) The highway may be located with reference to the possibility of subdividing a blighted district into smaller units each of which might be more easily developed into a housing project as a result of such division. (3) The highway in a broad right-of-way may provide needed space and a fire break in a blighted district, and if constructed in the form of a parkway can raise the residential desirability of abutting properties. (4) Plans for reconstructing entire blighted areas, particularly when such areas are conveniently located with respect to the central business district, and industrial districts, as they usually are, may make it more desirable and much more economical to provide mass transportation facilities than new highway facilities. Such housing plan as part of the master com-

munity plan, will influence the relative need for new highways and transit facilities in the long-range transportation plan.

Transportation shapes urban development and can be utilized as a planning aid: The development-shaping power of transportation facilities, particularly highways and transit lines, should not be lost sight of, as it evidently has been in various proposals for building express highways in urban areas. These proposals fail to take into account a desirable urban pattern, the appropriate location of districts for restricted residential, multiple residential, business and industrial uses.

A network of high speed highways superimposed on the average American city in competition with existing mass transportation facilities is likely to have a number of results, some not readily apparent. It is possible that the new facilities may cause great enough losses⁴ to private operating companies to cause the discontinuance of those services with resulting loss of property values in areas formerly served. There is likely to be an acceleration of movement to the suburbs, leaving behind new blighted areas. This movement would mean a waste of existing utility services in districts vacated and the provision of new services in outlying districts. Central district parking facilities would no doubt become still less adequate because travel would be increasingly by individual vehicles. In order to avoid the exorbitant cost of providing sufficient off-street parking facilities to meet the demand, numerous business establishments would probably move to subcenters. Industries of all kinds using motor vehicles for the assembling of raw materials or the shipment of finished products could be expected to take advantage of locations on express highways and in the absence of zoning regulations new industrial plants are likely to spring up in unexpected places, even in the suburbs.

Express highways may not be in competition with mass transportation, if they can provide for express bus operation. Transit experts are not all in agreement, however, that this is a complete answer; they point out that the short haul, not the long haul is the life blood of their business.

The planner and traffic engineer will do well to consider these possibilities, not with the idea of throttling community growth but with the idea of directing it towards a desirable pattern in which the various major residential, business and industrial developments will be located in districts suitable for the purpose rather than scattered inefficiently and mixed inharmoniously throughout the urban region.

Transportation can be the tool of the planner and traffic engineer in furthering a desirable urban pattern. All of the various media—local major streets, high speed highways, local and suburban transit—should be utilized in an effort to develop the urban districts in accord with the

⁴ The short-haul patronage in the more central areas would be reduced. The short haul is the life blood of the transit business. Express operations are uneconomic unless a certain density of patronage can be developed at all express stations, and unless certain portions of picked up passengers can be deposited at stations along the line.

desirable general pattern of the entire community and region. Admittedly, there are very few existing planning agencies equipped with the money or the directing and working personnel necessary to develop a comprehensive master plan of desirable and economic community development. This condition cannot be set up as primarily the result of lack of zeal on the part of planners and planning officials; it is a result of numerous conditions and difficulties, which will be touched upon later on in this report.

III

THAT THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES BE MEASURED AFTER TRAFFIC ENGINEERING HAS BEEN APPLIED TO MAKE THE MOST EFFICIENT USE OF EXISTING STREET AND TRANSIT FACILITIES.

General scope of traffic engineering: Traffic engineering as a profession is advancing rapidly. Many state highway departments, and certain cities, now employ traffic engineers; more cities should. The services of a traffic engineer are needed in each urban area of any size.

Traffic engineering includes many activities, the study of the characteristics of existing movements of all types, the behavior and necessary improvements in vehicles, the behavior and education of individual drivers and pedestrians, the redesign and improvement of existing street and transit facilities, the adequate traffic design of new facilities, etc.

Relatively few American cities have taken full advantage of the opportunity for bettering traffic conditions through the application of the most modern traffic engineering methods. One of the most important traffic engineering activities is obtaining the maximum efficiency, convenience, and safety from existing street, highway and transit facilities. Numerous individual improvements can be made in the existing circulatory system of any city, each with a certain resulting facilitation of movement and protection against hazard. The cumulative beneficial effects of all possible improvements is certain to be substantial. Stated in other words, more people can be transported faster in the same amount of street space or along the same transit line and at greater safety.

Typical traffic and transit improvements through the application of traffic engineering: Typical such improvements, consisting of construction items and items of regulation and control, are:

1. Redesign of hazardous and complicated intersections—such as by reshaping the intersection and providing traffic islands to channelize auto movements and reduce lengths of cross walks. Corner curb roundings to free right turns may be all that is needed.
Benefits: (a) Reduce vehicular and pedestrian hazard. (b) Increase

traffic capacity of intersections. (c) Increase vehicular and transit speeds by reducing delays. (d) Reduce the necessity for traffic signals.

2. Revision of arterial street system, signing certain through routes for certain purposes.

Benefits: (a) Facilitate all traffic movement. (b) Keep through traffic out of congested areas. (c) Keep commercial traffic primarily on specific routes. (d) Reduce over-all accidents.

3. Improvement of traffic signal operations—such as by timing signal operations for progressive movement, catering to transit operations when necessary.

Benefits: (a) Increase street capacity for automobiles and transit units. (b) Increase over-all speed by reducing delays. (c) Decrease accidents.

4. Removal of unnecessary signs and signals.

Benefits: (a) Increase over-all speed by reducing delays. (b) Reduce the motorists' contempt for traffic regulations, which is occasioned by unnecessary regulations.

5. Lane striping of all lanes on heavily travelled streets for their entire length; also all lanes approaching major intersections.

Benefits: (a) Increase traffic capacity. (b) Increase speed. (c) Decrease hazard due to crowding and sideswiping. (d) Secure better curb parking. (e) Decrease delays from improper intersection turning.

6. Elimination of curb parking at certain times and places—such as during rush hours on central district streets and main arterials, on narrow streets having transit, on all transit streets opposite safety zones, etc.

Benefits: (a) Increase street capacity for automobiles and transit vehicles during rush hours. (b) Increase vehicular and transit speeds. (c) Decrease hazard. (d) Decrease vehicular and transit delays at corners.

There are a multiplicity of additional items all assisting in the convenience of movement with safety. A few only are listed below:

7. Control of the hours of commercial delivery in congested districts.
8. Elimination of corner sight obstructions: signs, hedges, fences, etc. that block off a view of intersecting traffic.
9. Use of standard traffic devices, signs, signals and markings.
10. Posting speeds that signals are set for on progressively signalized arterials.
11. Controlling pedestrians by use of safety islands at street car stops or in the middle of wide streets.
12. Regulating the lengths and locations of curb cuts for driveways.

13. Improving street illumination and the illumination of safety islands, etc.
14. Stressing enforcement of laws against bad driving practices: Lane straddling; turning from wrong lane; weaving; driving in the center of the roadway; double parking.
15. More intelligent time regulation of curb parking and its enforcement.

These improvements will do more dollar for dollar good than will the construction of spectacular elevated highways. In every urban community the need for additional expensive transportation facilities will be lessened if traffic engineering is utilized to make the best use of what exists. In every urban center, therefore, the need for such new facilities should be measured after improvements in traffic conditions through the application of traffic engineering have been appraised.

IV

THAT TRANSIT MUST BE AN IMPORTANT ITEM IN ANY URBAN TRAFFIC ENGINEERING PROGRAM.

Traffic engineering plans for improvement of existing facilities cannot ignore transit. As has been stated, surface transit facilities, street cars, buses and trolley coaches, are used most heavily in congested areas, where individual automobile travel becomes difficult and where parking facilities are at a premium. In general, the larger the city, the greater the riding habit⁵ on transit facilities. The proportion of transit passengers to total persons travelling daily to and from the central business district increases generally with the size of the city. In most cities of 500,000 population or more, this proportion is one-half or greater.

Transit travel must be evaluated from the standpoint of congestion and economics: There are two outstanding advantages of transit travel under congested conditions:

1. Transit vehicles are the most economical users of street space in terms of passengers carried.
 - a. A surface street car line on one track with local stops can transport up to 13,500 persons per hour in one direction.
 - b. A motor bus line with local stops can transport up to 9000 persons per hour in one direction.
 - c. A trolley coach line can transport more persons than a motor bus line, but not as many as a street car line.
 - d. One lane of individual automobiles on a street having normal

⁵ Riding habit is the ratio between revenue passengers carried annually and the population of the community served.

intersections has a maximum passenger capacity of only 1530 persons per hour.⁶

- e. Even a lane of automobiles on an elevated highway with no intersection interference has a maximum passenger capacity of only about 2550 persons per hour.⁷
- f. There is a staggering difference between the maximum capacity of an express highway lane and that of an express transit line, with multiple unit train operation. The latter has an hourly capacity up to 60,000 persons per hour in one direction or almost 24 times the capacity of the express highway lane.

2. Transit passengers need no parking facilities.

In existing cities under present demands, curb parking spaces in central districts are at a premium. Parking time limits below a certain figure are not generally reasonable, cannot be enforced strictly, and provide no accommodation for the long-time parker. So there is little opportunity of increasing curb parking turnover thereby increasing the number of parking stalls available during the business day. The parking problem in central districts, therefore, resolves itself into one of obtaining additional facilities off the street; a conclusion which is now generally accepted.

The parking problem in each urban area should be intimately studied with relation to all the factors involved, which are many. In any such study it is quite important to recognize that one of the important modes of transportation, namely public transit, needs no parking facilities for its passengers.

While this Committee does not recommend curb parking elimination as a hard and fast rule for application in urban areas, certain readily apparent benefits can be pointed out. (a) Parking elimination will increase the capacity of central district streets. Commercial loading may continue to take place at the curb, but even so, the problem of double parking will be solved. (b) Transit riding may be increased, particularly if off-street parking spaces are not available to fill the demand.

Any parking study must go thoroughly into matters of cost and financing of off-street facilities and weigh these with the probable benefits in order to arrive at an economical justification of such facilities.

If any extensive highway development program is projected such as, for instance, that proposed in "Toll Roads and Free Roads," it must be realized that the central district parking problem will become still more acute and that, consequently, this problem must be taken into consideration.

⁶ Based on average occupancy of 1.7 persons per automobile and lane capacity of 900 automobiles per hour. There are very few streets on which this figure is exceeded. Many streets have a maximum lane capacity close to 700 vehicles per hour.

⁷ Based on average occupancy of 1.7 persons per automobile and 1500 automobiles per hour.

Certain transit improvements should be made:

1. Increased speed of transit operation.

One great advantage of the individual automobile over the transit vehicle is in the matter of speed; the running time is less between point of origin and destination. On short trips in congested areas, this advantage is about offset by parking difficulties. Transit properties, however, should do much more than has been done in the way of modernization of equipment. Modern transit equipment, streamlined street cars, trolley coaches and motor buses have far greater speed possibilities than the older equipment. Based on experience in cities where modern streamlined street cars⁸ have replaced older units on certain lines, over-all schedule speeds⁹ on lines have often increased, sometimes as much as 15 per cent. Actual speed increase on portions of lines is greater than over-all schedule speed increase, since the latter is the result of dividing line mileage by hours of operation, including layover time at terminals.

Traffic regulations on heavy transit streets, such as prevention of left turns and prevention of driving on the car track to the left of safety zones at intersections, will decrease transit delays and increase speeds. The latter regulation will not decrease intersection capacities if curb parking is eliminated opposite safety zones for a sufficient distance from corners.

Skip-stop operation, the elimination of transit stops at every other street in one direction and at alternate streets in the other direction, could be applied more broadly than it is now and with benefits as to speed. Transit managements fear public complaint against this operation, but it is believed that official traffic authorities could sponsor its inauguration as an experiment and retain it only where benefits result.

As has been mentioned, parking elimination at certain times and places, and the enforcement of double parking will reduce delays and increase speed.

2. Improvement of existing transit operations.

A study of traffic characteristics of individual transit lines will often disclose that reroutings of rail and bus lines are possible. Transit managements are of course expected to be aware of these possibilities but there are many difficulties, including changes in track and track special work, the unwillingness to incur additional undesirable obligations under franchise conditions, and management inertia, that may work against a change of route that would benefit both transit and automobile riders.

Street car and bus turns in congested areas cause considerable over-all

⁸ The cars are the P.C.C. cars and others having somewhat similar characteristics. The P.C.C. car was developed by the President's Conference Committee of the American Transit Association and has numerous improvements including fast and comfortable acceleration and deceleration, comfortable seats, quieter operation, pleasing appearance, etc. Up to March 1940 about 1200 modern street cars had been placed in operation, in thirteen cities in the United States and two cities in Canada.

⁹ The possibility of speed increase depends, of course, on the traffic characteristic of each line, on the volume of automobile traffic using the same street and on the number and manner of operation of traffic signals, etc.

traffic delay. Many of these turns are occasioned by the location of terminal loops in the central area. Although they may be occasionally necessary for tripper car operation during rush hour service, it is believed that a great many loop operations could be discontinued.

It is believed further that slack in schedules, which occasion loafing along the line and layovers at terminals, could be taken up, particularly during off peak hours.

Transit and traffic delays can be lessened by the better supervision of the operators of transit vehicles, who often unnecessarily loaf across signalized intersections, causing unnecessary delay to automobiles. Bus drivers often fail to pull out of a moving traffic lane for curb loading of passengers, partly because of inadequacy, improper location, or lack of enforcement of such loading spaces, partly because of driver carelessness. Everything possible should be done to enforce the observance of transit schedules, thus preventing the accumulation of transit vehicles at one point. This is most likely to occur on portions of streets traversed by a number of transit lines. These vehicles delay themselves as well as automobiles.

3. Rush hour improvements.

Control of the hours of commercial deliveries in congested areas has already been listed as a traffic aid. This control is particularly desirable in morning and evening rush hours, when streets and transit facilities are taxed to the limit by the movement of persons into and out of the central business district all at about the same time.

Everything possible should be done to lessen the demand for transportation for short periods each morning and evening. Peak traffic demand is of most serious concern to transit management, since it must have standby equipment and facilities to meet such demand. A scheme for reducing peak hour demands by spreading them over a longer period is the staggering of opening and closing hours of certain downtown businesses. This scheme has had much discussion but very little application in American cities, yet its potential benefits are great.

In San Francisco, in 1931, through the efforts of a private traffic committee, certain firms in the financial district changed to half-hour earlier opening hours in the morning and half-hour earlier closing hours in the afternoon. Even though only some 10,000 to 12,000 persons were affected by the change, beneficial effects were observed by the transit companies, the Yellow Cab Company, the Railway Express Company, the police traffic bureau and others. "Before-and-after" studies disclosed that street car speeds on Market Street were increased 12 per cent through the central business district. Some of the largest stores experienced an increase in business during the later afternoon, with no falling off at other periods. Certain stores actually adopted a later closing hour in order to cater to this business, incidentally helping to spread the peak. It should be pointed out that any reduction in the number of persons using transportation fa-

cilities in the peak hour is equivalent to adding capacity to streets and transit lines, or equivalent to street widening without its attending cost.

Intelligent official attitude necessary on transit improvements: Improvements in transit operations and various traffic plans to improve these operations should be the joint concern of traffic engineers and transit managements, who must cooperate to secure needed improvements. Transit considerations must be an important item in any urban traffic engineering program.

Public officials must give transit managements a fair opportunity for making such improvements. One possible method would be the revision of the older street car franchises, which transit managements term obsolete and unfair. Another would be restriction of the licensing of competing transportation services. It is believed that such action on the part of public officials would release capital and create incentive which would make purchase of modern equipment and other improvements possible.¹⁰

V

THAT MODERN HIGHWAYS MUST BE DESIGNED WITH REFERENCE TO
ACCESS TO AND USE OF ABUTTING PROPERTY.

General considerations in regard to right-of-way width and treatment: The committee limits this discussion to main highways, such as trunk lines and major laterals or connections, where uninterrupted and safe movement of vehicles is the objective.

There can be no fixed rule covering the width and design features of highways; designs that are applicable in one case will prove unsatisfactory in others. It cannot be arbitrarily stated that highways shall be depressed, that they shall be elevated, or that they shall have certain widths. The problem resolves itself into the determination of just what each highway is to accomplish and the specification of those accomplishments in minimum terms. These will include such things as:

1. The planned capacity of the highway in terms of vehicles per hour and day, average and peak loads.
2. The rate of speed at which traffic is to be moved. (This will be a determining factor in estimating capacity.)
3. The character of the traffic to be carried; trucks and freight traffic,

¹⁰ Up to this point the committee, in considering the whole subject of highways and transportation facilities in and around cities, has dwelt on basic considerations in planning such facilities and possible improvements in existing facilities. Comprehensive planning along the lines recommended will disclose the actual need for new and better highways and when they are built standards of design and construction should assure a long period of functioning for their original purpose. Furthermore, there is a vital need for reserving land for such projects, as otherwise the cost of ultimate acquisition will, in many cases, be prohibitive. Lastly, some official agency should be primarily responsible for the making of the necessary plans. Further findings of the committee in this preliminary report deal with these matters.

passenger cars only, mixed traffic. Are transient operations included?

4. The present and future character of the district traversed by the highway and the degree of protection necessary for the district and for the highway (each may detract from the value or efficiency of the other).
5. The type and frequency of access points.
6. Intersections requiring grade separations in the first instance, and ultimately.
7. The provision of service streets for abutting property, where required or desirable.
8. The closing of existing intersecting streets, where feasible or necessary.
9. The provision of extra width permitting redesign of abutting properties to provide usable sites in harmony with the character of the surrounding district.
10. The use of accelerating and decelerating lanes, center dividing strips, traffic islands, etc.

Design should vary with character of the various contiguous districts:

From the foregoing it becomes apparent that the design features for any highway will change materially as it passes through rural, suburban, urban residential, industrial and central business districts.

In rural and suburban districts a surface freeway with grade separation of all important intersections may be indicated. Unimportant cross streets may be dead ended or connected by a loop to other similar streets. The picking up and disposition of the local streets are as much a part of the problem as the design of the freeway proper. In residential areas a parkway or a wide right-of-way with depressed roadways will serve two purposes: (a) To protect the residential character of the district, (b) to facilitate the separation of cross traffic where there is much circulatory traffic to be accommodated.

In industrial districts a surface freeway with paralleling service streets may be indicated, provided there is not a large amount of circulatory traffic to be accommodated, in which case depressed or elevated roadways may be required. In high value central business districts elevated roadways have proved to be most satisfactory for through traffic which has no beneficial service to perform in the district and requires no service from the district. In central districts where right-of-way costs may easily exceed 90 per cent of the total cost of a superhighway, the width of such right-of-way becomes constricted to its absolute minimum, but even this is affected by the necessity of providing connecting ramps with surface streets and by the location and design of such ramps.

The desirability of ever building an elevated highway in the high class retail portion of the central district is open to question; possibly it should skirt the district and not enter it. In an attempt to alleviate somewhat

the damage to retail business values due to elevated structures, proposals have been made to run such structures through the centers of blocks.

Design considerations through residential areas: Particular considerations must be given in the design of the surface highway through urban residential and rural areas, as follows: (1) The needs of adjacent and surrounding property as to the provision of service streets and access points. (2) The character of the surrounding district and the effect that the highway may have on the district. (3) The present or possible ultimate effect of the surrounding district on the highway.

The construction of a high-speed highway through urban and suburban areas may bring the highway and its contiguous territory into conflict. It may be said definitely that each will affect the other adversely if the highway under discussion is one to which abutting property has the unlimited right of access and where there are no zoning regulations or inadequate regulations. Zoning may not always furnish protection of a permanent nature in cities where it applies to property abutting a heavy traffic street to which such property has the right of access. Political bodies often find it hard to withstand the pressure of determined property owners, especially if nearly all are in accord in demanding the right to erect business structures along the traffic street their properties abut. Absence of the right of access is more positive protection to the highway from the damage that invariably results whenever uncontrolled business districts spring up along its borders. The constant stopping and standing of vehicles along the curb line and the confusion caused by cars entering and leaving the traffic stream reduces the capacity of the highway and greatly increases the number of traffic accidents.

The limited access highway may have a detrimental effect on surrounding residential areas. The absence of paralleling local service streets, unless sufficient flanking width is provided in their stead, may result in blighted areas. The lack of zoning regulations will accelerate the rate of blight and the depreciation of property values. On the other hand, in sparsely developed suburban communities, the construction of an express highway may encourage the development of contiguous and surrounding areas to the extent of taxing the capacity of the highway unless the development has been anticipated and provided for in the construction of the highway.

Wider rights-of-way are economic in the long run: As has been stated, it is not possible to say what the right-of-way width for a modern highway should be. There are many factors to be considered in each case that should help determine the width, but, unfortunately, one of the most important factors is the high cost of the desired right-of-way.

From a traffic standpoint there is danger of excessive roadway width. An express highway roadway of more than three moving lanes in each direction should probably be avoided.

Economically, from the standpoint of neighborhood values and hence the maintenance or enhancement of tax returns, a wide right-of-way is far superior to a narrow one. Sufficient width to permit properly located service or access streets, with ample open or planted space between the swift moving traffic streams and the adjoining privately owned property, will tend to prevent a fringe of depreciated property values along the right-of-way. A narrow right-of-way that provides only for traffic and that leaves buildings fronting the highway on one side with rears exposed on the other, is one that will promote a fringe of blight. Blight has a tendency to be contagious; it is largely chance whether or not this fringing blight will spread through the entire district, with a resultant drop in property values and loss of tax returns. The total loss to the community may easily exceed the cost of an adequate right-of-way that would have been preventive.

Excess condemnation may be necessary for protective purposes: The consideration of ample rights-of-way necessarily leads to a discussion of acquiring enough land to permit the rearrangement or redesign of abutting property for the mutual protection of the highway and the property. It is usually the case that the route of a major traffic way will lead through platted or developed property within the confines of a city. The practice of taking only enough right-of-way to accommodate the traffic lanes rarely, if ever, will leave fractions of lots that are of a size or shape suitable for development except for non-residential purposes. A method that offers a solution is the taking of land in excess of that required for the actual construction of the roadway, replatting it and reselling it with restrictions as to access and the use of property. In this manner a good residential district can be protected against deterioration, sometimes even benefited, and the intended function of the highway can be preserved.

Many recently constructed highways are now obsolete: All of the well considered information indicates that there is a definite relationship between highway design and width of right-of-way, and access to and use of abutting property. If the matters of access and use could be disregarded, the width of the right-of-way could be determined by the traffic carrying requirements alone. This is not possible because the traffic load of the highway is directly related to the character of the district it traverses. It goes even further than that because the ultimate traffic load depends to some extent upon the future use of property in contiguous districts. The right of access from abutting properties and the uncontrolled use of those properties have operated to destroy the efficiency of highways. Planners and traffic engineers can cite examples of highways in their own communities that are of ample width to carry the traffic load normally imposed upon them if the right of access were limited and if the highways were not lined with all kinds of "stop and shop" businesses such as fruit stands, eating palaces, used car lots, tourist camps, gas sta-

tions, etc., etc. These developments have often required the relocation of a highway, recently constructed as a by-pass around an urban area, and have led to the popular use of the term "by-passing the by-pass."

The total cross section of any surface highway should consist of width necessary for traffic and an extra width necessary for protection of the highway and for protection of the abutting property. In "Toll Roads and Free Roads" there is an excellent discussion of the necessity of such excess width for the purpose of protecting the highway, and the necessity of so sloping and planting cuts and fills that they will not mar the landscape. There is a discussion also of legal difficulties in the way of preventing or controlling access to any highway. The committee intends to study the problem of access control more thoroughly and to discuss it in the final report. Also, it intends to go more thoroughly into the matter of extra width and type of design necessary for complete protection of abutting districts.

VI

THAT MORE ATTENTION BE GIVEN BY PUBLIC AUTHORITIES TO THE PRESERVATION OF LAND NEEDED FOR HIGHWAYS IN ADVANCE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Problems of right-of-way acquisition and methods of protection for future acquisition: The acquisition of needed rights-of-way presents probably the greatest problem in the systematic and economical carrying out of a long-term program of major street and highway improvements. The lack or inadequacy of funds, legal inhibitions and cumbersome procedures combine to make land acquisition an almost insurmountable obstacle.

Protection of needed rights-of-way against new structures and means for acquiring such rights-of-way at the most favorable opportunity, well ahead of actual construction if necessary, are imperative for the success of a planned program of highway development. Otherwise the cost may become prohibitive or may force compromises that will whittle away the comprehensive plan.

Problems of right-of-way protection and acquisition should be recognized by all agencies concerned. In unbuilt or sparsely settled suburban areas, rights-of-way if not needed at once can often be obtained through the control of the layout of subdivisions. Effective control over private developments within the highway corridor may be accomplished, without acquisition of title, by county zoning or by state-wide regulation¹¹ of roadside uses and access roads. In closely built-up areas, often nothing short of outright acquisition and resale with appropriate restrictions is likely

¹¹ This method has had little, if any, application, but is being considered by planners and highway authorities.

to assure the redevelopment of abutting properties in a manner satisfying the requirements of modern highway design and the desirable use and protection of such properties. Building line and mapped street enactments may, if based on comprehensive plans, utilize the police power for preserving needed rights-of-way¹² in built-up areas and may materially reduce ultimate land costs if the highway improvement can be deferred.

Early outright acquisition may be unavoidable and ultimately economical in deteriorated sections where the property costs are often about as low as they ever will be; also, in rapidly growing but as yet sparsely developed suburban areas. Funds for such acquisition are rarely available, however. Thus far the federal government has been unwilling to assume any part of the cost of right-of-way acquisition, and states and municipalities hardly ever have funds for acquiring necessary land in advance, or the means for raising such funds.

But lack of funds is by no means the only difficulty. Others consist of statutory or constitutional limitations; narrow interpretation of what constitutes a public purpose; cumbersome, expensive and drawn out procedures under eminent domain statutes; and the absence of, or narrowly limited, authority for the use of excess taking or excess condemnation.

Urbanism committee recommendations on securing land needed for public projects: Another and fundamental obstacle to an intelligent and economical right-of-way acquisition program was and still is lack of comprehensive long-term plans for major streets and highway improvements. "It is believed to be beyond question," says the report on toll roads and free roads, "that a proper handling of the acquisition of land for public purposes requires reasonably long anticipation and careful and coordinated planning of all the public purposes that may be affected by every proposed purchase."

The above difficulties in the acquisition of land by public authorities are not limited, of course, to highways, but apply equally to all types of essential public improvements—recreation areas, schools, public housing projects, and others. After studies of this whole problem, the Urbanism Committee of the National Resources Committee recommended the following: "Better to control urban development, to combat land speculation, and to have land available for low-rent housing, recreational, educational and other public facilities likely to be increasingly required in the future, the Committee advocates a more liberal policy of land acquisition by municipalities and accordingly recommends the liberalizing of the fundamental laws of the state in order to permit urban authorities to

¹² In California, for instance, the 1937 Planning Act authorizes the preparation and adoption of official plans under the master street and highways plan, which is required to be first prepared and adopted by the planning commission. An official plan may be the establishment of building lines or future width lines for ultimate highway right-of-way purposes, and will be enacted as an ordinance by the local legislative body.

acquire, hold, and dispose of land with greater freedom and to allow a wider interpretation of the term 'public use.'

"Since opportunities for land acquisition often are best when the urban community is least able financially to make such outlays, the Committee recommends that the suggested federal credit agency should be authorized to make loans to urban communities for the acquisition of both improved and unimproved real estate for the purposes mentioned above."¹³

In regard to a suggested federal credit agency: "The (Urbanism) Committee further recommends legislation creating a federal credit agency authorized to make loans and grants under adequate legislative safeguards to state and local governments for the purposes of public-works construction, acquisition or construction of public utilities, land purchases, and similar capital outlays, and for extending credit to these governments in periods of economic stress. At the same time, the Committee believes that direct federal expenditures in cities should be reduced to a minimum."¹⁴

In "Toll Roads and Free Roads" it is recommended that a Federal Land Authority be set up to itself acquire, hold, and lease to states and local communities, lands or rights-of-way needed for public improvements.

This Committee recommends that public officials give serious thought to these proposals in the light of the necessity of securing land needed for public improvements. The Committee hopes to be able to treat this subject more comprehensively in its final report.

VII

THAT THE COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING INDICATED AS NECESSARY
HEREIN SHOULD BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE LOCAL PLANNING
AGENCY, WITH THE ADVICE, COOPERATION AND SUPPORT OF LOCAL,
STATE AND FEDERAL OFFICIALS, INCLUDING TRAFFIC ENGINEERS.

Local planning agency must prepare properly related plans: Enabling legislation for local planning in many states has advanced to the point where authority to plan is as broad and comprehensive as plans of local agencies can practically be. The trend is toward the adoption of similar comprehensive planning legislation in other states. In general, such legislation authorizes the local preparation of master plans, covering such things as streets and highways, transit and transportation, land use and zoning, housing, parks and recreation, public services and facilities, public buildings, general community design (subdivision standards), and conservation. The portions of the broad general master plan are effectuated.

¹³ OUR CITIES, Their Role in the National Economy. National Resources Committee, Washington, D. C., 1937, pp. 76 and 77.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 80-81.

ated by detailed plans and regulations that are enacted as ordinances under police power authority, the most common of such ordinances being zoning, subdivision and building line ordinances.

The observation of planners is that the tendency of the courts is more and more towards a broad interpretation of the term "public welfare" in decisions on police power planning regulations, particularly where such regulations are for the purpose of effectuating the comprehensive master plan or thoroughly studied portions of it.

Planning is progressing, slowly to be sure, but progressing nevertheless to a more comprehensive stage. Police power regulations, hardly dreamed of today, may be common practice tomorrow for effectuating the master plan.

The local planning agency has been legalized as the advising agency to the local legislative body in the development and redevelopment of the community through the planning process. It is hardly conceivable that this comprehensive legal machinery should be discarded and that some other agency should be proposed for the preparation of any portion of the master plan.

This committee finds, therefore, that the general transportation plan of the city or urban region including streets and highways, transit and transportation, and the coordination of such facilities with other planned development, should be appropriately prepared by the local planning agency, with the cooperation of federal and state highway authorities, traffic engineers and local public authorities.

Some of the weaknesses of planning agencies and the difficulties of planning that must be overcome: Admittedly, very few local planning agencies are prepared to undertake such an assignment and few traffic engineering departments exist or are sufficiently equipped to lend the necessary traffic planning aid. Most of them are now handicapped by a combination of difficulties—legal, financial, personnel, and others—which will have to be removed or overcome.

Inquiring into the difficulties with which planning agencies are beset, the Urbanism Committee of the National Resources Committee found: "To begin with, city planning bodies lack sufficient legal powers to guide effectively the physical, social, and economic structure of the community through the instrumentality of a comprehensive plan broadly construed. They are subject to uninformed official and public opinion which does not fully appreciate the great importance of community planning. They often encounter jealousy and even opposition on the part of administrative departments. They suffer from insufficient appropriations and a scarcity of competent technical planning personnel. They are themselves sometimes at fault, because they lack sincere interest and vigor in performing their task of which they often have but a limited understanding or a narrow view.

"Even where legal powers and planning practices are most advanced,

local planning agencies seldom have even advisory authority over all public works projects within the area under their jurisdiction, but are limited to projects of their own local government. Nor do they have such authority over the facilities of transportation, transit, and utility agencies, except when the proposed changes directly affect a public facility or public property . . ."¹⁵

Of the recommendations advanced by the Urbanism Committee to remedy these difficulties and weaknesses, the following two are of special significance from the standpoint of planning for a more adequate local highway and transportation system: (1) That official planning agencies be given "the same authority over projects in the areas within their jurisdiction which are constructed, authorized, or aided by any other local authority or state agency, as is provided for projects of their own local government. There should be included in such jurisdiction the proposals before the state regulatory agencies over transport and utility matters when these involve the location, extension, or change in the use of facilities."¹⁶ And (2) that "a policy should be adopted by the federal government requiring that all federal agencies submit to the official local planning body, if such exists, for its review and recommendation, the plans of all physical projects to be located in the area under the jurisdiction of such local planning body which are to be constructed, aided, or authorized by the federal government. These federal agencies should consider such recommendations and should be guided in their actions by the same minimum requirements as apply under state laws or local charters to the local authorities. Included among the federal agencies that are thus to submit their proposals to such local planning bodies should be the existing or future regulatory agencies for transportation and other public utilities when the proposals of these agencies involve the location, extent, or change in the use of facilities."¹⁶

This committee believes that in normal times, and particularly in these times, from the standpoint of the national defense, adequately staffed and financed planning agencies and traffic engineering departments are essential for transportation and traffic planning. Also, from the standpoint of the national defense, prompt and vigorous action on such planning is needed.

Assistance should be given local planning agencies: The cost of preparing a master plan of street and highway development includes the obtaining of competent planning advice and direction, and the obtaining of data. These costs are manifestly a charge against the construction costs of such traffic ways, just as is the cost of preparing construction plans and specifications. Roads funds should therefore be made available for planning work of this nature. A part of federal and state assistance in

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 63.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

such local planning could take the form of a loan of services of highway specialists and other personnel. These authorities could properly require that local funds in reasonable amounts be made available to the planning agency as a condition of eligibility for such assistance. The existing highway planning survey data and additional such data in the future should be made readily available in detail to local planning and traffic engineering agencies. Adequately staffed traffic engineering departments are a requisite for traffic planning aid; the design of streets and highways from the surface up to meet modern traffic and safety needs.

Support by highway authorities of the idea of comprehensive local planning, and further support of the validity of the finished plan, in addition to aids already mentioned, would greatly strengthen local planning.

Zoning is a good example of the necessity of such support. Zoning regulations of the use of property and the intensity of development of property abutting highways, must be prepared intelligently and adopted for many miles of highways. Highway authorities are beginning to realize this, but they should realize also, as pointed out elsewhere in this report, that such regulation can be whittled away to almost nothing by the insistent demands of abutting owners for unlimited highway access and unrestricted use. Highway authorities must consider and be ready to act on a vigorous program of support of such regulations, once established.

Multiple planning jurisdiction in the same urban area is a difficulty: A complicating factor in planning is the composition of the region or the metropolitan area that should properly be included in comprehensive plans. This metropolitan area usually consists of several cities and sometimes several counties. Coordination between the various existing planning agencies becomes a prime necessity, as otherwise plans proposing different community patterns may overlap and probably will. In a situation such as this the following questions arise:

1. Shall any single local planning agency be responsible for preparing the necessary comprehensive plan for the entire metropolitan area? This may be the largest city, where there is one large city and a number of satellite cities, or it may be the county, where only one county is involved.
2. Is a regional planning commission required for stimulation of local planning and securing coordination between all such plans?
3. Can the state planning board provide the stimulation and coordination necessary?

The committee intends to give more study to this problem and to discuss it more fully in the final report. At the present time it does not desire to express an opinion; the problem is being pointed out as one worthy of consideration by planners and planning officials.

CONCLUSION

It is hoped that this preliminary report will stimulate local planning agencies, traffic engineering departments and all public agencies concerned with highways and other forms of transportation facilities, to the end that more comprehensive consideration of the entire subject be given. It is further hoped that a common interest in an important and complex problem will bring about a better working relationship between all the various agencies including private transportation operators.

The presentation of preliminary findings is for thought-provoking purposes primarily at this time. In the final report these findings may be qualified or made more specific. Some of them may be considerably altered as a result of additional study and exchange of views among the members. It should be emphasized that this report is preliminary and that its findings do not necessarily represent the views of all committee members.

In the final report the committee hopes to present a more extensive and penetrating discussion of the entire subject, including the various problems briefly touched upon herein, and to indicate desirable solutions wherever possible. Contributions of data and ideas will be welcomed from highway authorities, planners, traffic engineers and others professionally interested in this subject.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

REPORTER: William J. Fox, *Chief Engineer, Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission.*

DISCUSSION LEADERS: Fred W. Fisch, *Director, Schenectady Bureau of Traffic and City Planning.*

L. I. Hewes, *Chief, Western Region, Public Roads Administration.*

Herbert L. Russell, *City Planner and Secretary, Detroit City Plan Commission.*

R. G. Tyler, *Professor of Sanitary Engineering, University of Washington.*

Mr. Fisch, who opened the discussion, did not question the preliminary findings of the committee from a planning standpoint. The major theme of his discussion was a method of obtaining results in coordinating highways and transportation with other planned development. An important item in this result is obtaining support for planning commissions and completed plans. This may be difficult to do because we are still living down some of the failings of the past. "Many of you will recall the planning era of not so long ago when a wave of planning activity swept

over the country and plans of various descriptions were developed, many of which visualized utopian cities built around beautiful civic centers zoned to accommodate the most amazing increases in population. We must recognize, however, that the planners of that era . . . failed to see the cycle of depression in the offing which was to preclude any expenditure of large sums for capital improvements, or the static and even declining population totals which have been disclosed by the recent census figures. The developments of the last decade forced many well-meant plans to the storage shelf to accumulate dust and in the light of present-day conditions to become out-moded."

A general suggestion, Mr. Fisch said, is to have in mind the principal features of the master plan and to follow up with a step-by-step program, so that the planning projects will really get beyond the paper stage. "This approach has been substantially pointed out in the section of the committee report which deals with traffic engineering. Considering that traffic engineering, traffic planning and city planning are interrelated, a first step could well be an inventory of the existing facilities for expediting traffic movement with maximum safety . . . A second step could well be a traffic survey, its elaborateness being dependent upon the uses to which the data are to be put. Following the accumulation and analysis of facts from such a survey, certain further traffic improvements might be made . . . A successive step in the orderly program of approach to this entire problem might include a study of land use, population and population growth. (Preliminary 1940 census returns are making many communities sit up and take notice.) From the facts obtained by such a study, steps could be taken to give serious thought to zoning or revision of existing zoning legislation."

Mr. Fisch also stressed the matter of acquisition of lands for future public use. "Any such program, of course, would involve the expenditure of money, at a time when cities are growing conservative and watching their credit ratings carefully. The suggested possibilities of a federal credit agency to assist communities in a program of land accumulation for future projects should be thoroughly investigated."

Coordination between the various existing planning agencies in a given region is also necessary, according to Mr. Fisch, and he cited the New York State Federation of Planning Officials as an example.

Mr. Hewes found no fault with the preliminary findings of the committee to the effect that highways and transportation should be planned with regard to other features of community or regional development. He pointed out that major urban highway improvement is predominately a local problem and preferably should be solved by reference to a master plan. "I doubt, however," Mr. Hewes continued, "if such a plan immediately can be set up to show all major highways of the future, or that no major improvement can be undertaken until such plan is available. I should say that there exist in many areas certain obvious 'hook-ups' or

connections between the city streets and the rural areas beyond the urban influence. There are some more or less natural approaches that must not wait. True, a basic plan of all major approach highways would be a splendid prerequisite . . .

"It begins to appear," Mr. Hewes commented, "that existing urban business centralization in some areas cannot be preserved without more efficient, rapid mass transportation . . . It is not self-evident, however, that the reconstruction of blighted areas will make it more desirable and economical to provide mass transportation rather than new highway facilities. It is quite obvious that bus transportation on freeways must be given due consideration . . . If such a danger of blight exists, it does exist partly because of the preference, with motor transport, of added numbers of people to live in the suburban areas. It thus does not appear that people can be confined to central areas on the ground of preserving street car investments. However, unnecessary suburban development probably should be discouraged, as it is expensive to the public."

Usefulness rather than existence should be the determining factor in the retention of certain transit facilities, Mr. Hewes believes, and the complete planning involved is the responsibility primarily of an established planning authority.

The Public Roads Administration, Mr. Hewes said, welcomes the opportunity of cooperating with official planning agencies and all other public bodies, and has made it a policy to do so over a period of years, since the planning program will no doubt broaden the nature of highway projects as they are related to master plans.

Mr. Russell suggested as topics for discussion two related matters—appraisals and analyses. "Both of these matters," Mr. Russell said, "appear particularly important because each offers subtle liabilities to a faulty start or approach and because in this transitory stage of world trends of civilization, it is even more necessary that our keen, long-visioned foresight in transportation shall be reasonably sure and unmistakable. That is a chief distinguishing feature of city planning and one on which its future so largely depends.

"The report of the transportation committee, providing as it does for the broadest and most complete outline of transportation, carries with it," Mr. Russell continued, "the responsibility of providing also for some method of analysis and appraisal of the various forms, types and systems in order to know how their interrelationships can most economically be coordinated. The reliability and dependability of conclusions will necessarily be dependent upon the accuracy of the data and information used."

Mr. Russell believes that if an identification and evaluation of all the factors involved in the transportation problem were made, a more impersonal and scientific method of comparison could be obtained. In this way, many prejudices would be eliminated.

"In endeavoring to determine the economic value and the comparative

serviceability of each and every method, form, type and system of transportation, we must not compare the actual costs, operations and procedures," Mr. Russell emphasized, "but rather the potential best under reasonably practical conditions." With a standardized system of appraisals, he concluded, more dependable and conclusive results can be obtained than under present methods of comparison.

Mr. Tyler spoke extemporaneously, urging that the committee's work be continued. He indicated many lines along which useful information might be collected, and made a number of suggestions for making the final report more effective.

Zoning: How Far Have We Come? How Far Can We Go?

HUGH R. POMEROY

Director, Virginia State Planning Board

When we ask how far we have come in zoning, whom do we mean by "We?" The planners, as represented by what planners propose? The people, as represented by zoning ordinances in effect? Or the courts, as represented by decisions in zoning cases?

First of all, as between the planners and the people, there are so few planners and so many people. There are about 1,700 zoned cities in the United States and most of their zoning ordinances were prepared without the benefit of any high priest of planning (although it must be admitted that provisions from consultant-prepared zoning ordinances are frequently copied from ordinance to ordinance, until some regulation designed for a situation in New York City will finally show up in a zoning ordinance proposed for Farmville, with its population of 3,500). We must conclude that the distance we have come in zoning must be measured by the average front line of the zoning ordinances now in effect, and not by what the planning technicians may propose. So let us technicians consider ourselves to be a part of the people, at least for the purpose of this discussion: it may be good for us.

When we consider zoning as practiced in relation to the attitude of the courts, we must conclude that the courts, in general, are ahead of the people—ahead of this average front line of zoning about which we are talking. Even back in the "B. E." days of zoning (that is, "Before Euclid") a state supreme court, apparently tired of such weaseling arguments as that commercial uses could be kept out of residence districts because of the danger of the spread of disease by flies, declared that: "Justification for residential zoning may, in the last analysis, be rested upon the protection of the civic and social values of the American home. The establishment of such districts is for the general welfare because it tends to promote and perpetuate the American home. It is axiomatic that the welfare, and indeed the very existence of a nation depends upon the character and the caliber of its citizenry. The character and quality of manhood and womanhood are in a large measure the result of home environment. The home and its intrinsic influences are the very foundation of good citizenship, and any factor contributing to the establishment of homes and the fostering of home life doubtless tends to the enhancement not only of community life but of the life of the nation as a whole."¹

¹ Miller v. Board of Public Works, 195 Cal. 492.

In less than ten years after the Euclid Village case another state supreme court was willing to uphold restrictive regulations applying to billboards, not on the ground that they might fall down and injure someone, but on the ground (among others) that they are an invasion of the highway travelers' right to be free from annoyance and that they impair the scenery, the protection of which is declared to be a public purpose.² More recently another court has upheld drastic regulations designed to protect scenery and has had the courage to say: "Perhaps a higher court will decide that. . . . I have attempted to force the hands of the clock forward too rapidly. If so, I am still confident that time will ultimately justify my judgment."³

The import of the decision first quoted is now found echoed in numerous zoning decisions; the others remain more or less isolated. Is this because the principle involved in one is sounder than that involved in the other? Not at all. The first decision was rendered fifteen years ago and during the ensuing time zoning in practice has been catching up with what the court then said. The other decisions referred to were rendered more recently, and zoning in practice is not anywhere near the limits to which the courts in these decisions have said it could go. The courts cannot lead the way in zoning; they can only feed on what is set before them. Progress is made only as zoning in practice moves ahead of what the courts have already sanctioned. The courts have been willing, as shown by their decisions in cases arising from pioneering efforts, to move forward much more rapidly than the people in general, as represented by the average front of zoning in practice, are willing to go.

This is not at all to say that everything which is new is thereby good; nor that the courts will approve every excursion from the sanctuary of established judicial opinion. There are limits beyond which the courts will not let zoning go; but it is important to realize that the limitations are not so much on advancing as on straying laterally. It therefore becomes necessary for zoning to develop a sense of direction along the axis of service to human welfare so that there will be a minimum of confusion as to which way lies forward and which would lead off the path into the bushes of whimsy.

To illustrate, the courts are willing to uphold regulations which are designed to protect the character of residential neighborhoods, but very properly they will not permit this to be done by the unsound method of establishing valuation restrictions as a part of zoning, and will require that the regulations shall deal with the qualities of the thing being regulated in their relationship to the character of the neighborhood. The courts will not uphold some isolated regulation having an esthetic purpose nor one depending for its application on the taste of an administrative officer,

² General Outdoor Advertising Co. v. Department of Public Works, 289 Mass. 149.

³ Monterey County v. William Thomas Bassett, et al., Superior Court of Monterey County, Calif., No. 16969.

but will uphold regulations heretofore regarded as being largely esthetic when these regulations are based on a comprehensive plan and especially when they interlock with other regulations which also have for their purpose the effectuation of the objectives of that plan.

The courts, although willing to sanction new types of regulations which are clearly designed to serve the public welfare and which are based on comprehensive planning, will not permit zoning to get too far ahead of the thinking of the people or too far beyond what the people in general will accept. This attitude is not with any conscious design of preserving what we vaguely call "democratic processes." Rather, it is simply the way in which democracy works. It has the very practical result of assuring that zoning, given proper administration, will work; since, if zoning is expressive of the general attitude of the people of the community, it will represent a way of doing things which the people have set for themselves.

How far we have come in zoning can be told in the story of the last twenty-five years, for zoning, as we accept the term today, is about that old. Its forerunners go back over two centuries before that. They began with regulations designed to exclude dangerous structures and noisome uses from congested areas, as illustrated by enactments in 1692 restricting slaughter houses to certain localities in Boston, Charlestown and Salem, and an enactment in 1706 requiring that a common powder house for Boston should be located outside the populous areas of the city. The advance made during the ensuing two centuries was no more than from these simple regulations to regulations designed to keep industrial uses out of residential areas, as exemplified by ordinances of the city of Los Angeles, adopted in 1909, which divided the city into industrial districts and a general residential district from which certain industrial uses were excluded.

These latter regulations logically grew into those in which there was a more detailed differentiation among classes of districts than simply, as in the Los Angeles regulations, between those in which industrial uses were permitted and those in which they were not; or, as in other early enactments, between residential and non-residential districts. Several important occurrences during the first quarter of the present century led to an almost explosive expansion of these rudimentary regulations into urban zoning as we know it today. These were:

1. Rapid increase in urban population. The rapidity of growth of cities tended toward heterogeneity of land use, both in previously developed areas and in widening areas of transition of use, and brought about the invasion of newer areas by haphazard development.
2. In larger cities, development of the skyscraper concurrently with the period of major urban growth. This was accompanied by land overcrowding, with resulting traffic congestion and inadequacy of light and air.
3. Rapid increase in the use of the automobile, resulting in: (a) Greater

mobility of population, tending to change established community patterns and thus to impair the stability of earlier land-use relationships. (b) Extensive use of the automobile instead of means of mass transportation, thus lessening the relative importance of local and interurban transit lines. This caused the abandonment of many transit lines and required changes in types of transit, with consequent alteration of community land-use and population-distribution patterns. (c) Stagnation of property along traffic thoroughfares (apart from central business districts) by reason of impairment of its desirability for residential purposes as a result of heavy streams of traffic, automobile parking, and the tendency of commercial uses to scatter along such thoroughfares rather than to develop as business districts properly designed in relation to traffic and to surrounding neighborhoods. (d) The need for provision of the specialized requirements of the automobile, such as servicing, repair, storage, and standing space. Garages and filling stations intruded into residential neighborhoods and retail shopping districts; automobile wrecking yards scattered themselves along traffic thoroughfares; and conflict arose between traffic movements and automobile parking.

All the results noted have strikingly interlocked with one another and have interacted on one another. As older neighborhoods have become less desirable, the urge has been to move "farther out," and the exodus to the suburbs has occurred in cities throughout the country. The larger cities have seen the development of satellite communities, these being not merely convenient neighborhood shopping centers, but replicas, on a smaller scale, of the downtown center itself. All these developments led one court, in deciding a zoning case, to comment on "the growing complexity of modern urban life."

These problems in community development have been intensified by land speculation and the tendency to treat land as an exploitable commodity and to regard land ownership as absolute, entailed with a minimum of social responsibility. Some of the effects of this have been population congestion, inadequate provision of essential community facilities, unsound land values, subdivision far in advance of or in excess of need, and instability of land utilization.

At the same time the increase of general education, a slowly rising level of culture and the increase of leisure time have led to a more critical examination of the social and economic adequacy of cities and their neighborhoods, and there is a growing demand for more satisfactory community patterns and for greater orderliness in community development. A growing social consciousness has led to a recognition that desirability of residential surroundings should not be dependent primarily on the wealth of the inhabitants, but should be attained and maintained for all through measures of community planning and control.

But this growing social consciousness has not come alone from the stirring of men's souls. Of powerful effect has been the general detri-

mental result—and, even more so, the direct cost to property owners and to the community as a whole—of the misuse of land and of urban deterioration. Conflicting uses and haphazard development impair property values and destroy neighborhood character; they tend toward the stagnation of property which would otherwise be beneficially used in an orderly manner; they result ultimately in spreading areas of obsolescence, deterioration and decay, costly to maintain, economically unproductive, and socially detrimental. These results of earlier unplanned development are harassing cities the country over.

All these needs combined to present the insistent problem of correcting the results of haphazard urban development in the past and of obtaining orderliness in urban development in the future. It is this problem which called forth zoning as one measure of solution.

Urban zoning as now in general use provides for more or less complex regulations applying to the uses of land and buildings, the height and bulk of buildings, the open spaces about buildings, and the density of population. It has undergone three kinds of expansion in its brief quarter of a century of development. These have been successive in their origin, but each has continued, and all three are now in process.

The first expansion of zoning was from its early simple form, usually consisting simply of one class each of residential, commercial and industrial districts, to a more detailed differentiation among major classes of use. Thus, it is now customary for an urban zoning plan to include districts of the following classes: one-family residential, two-family residential, multiple residential (with further differentiation within these classes of residential districts on the basis of density of population), retail business, general commercial, general industrial and heavy industrial. Many zoning ordinances show further differentiation than this, setting up specialized types of retail business districts, or districts in which residential character is modified by low-density suburban conditions.

Along with the more detailed differentiation among major classes of use has come a broadening of the scope of zoning regulations themselves. This, in the main, is not found along the broad front of zoning, but in a few notable examples which point the way on. Thus, some zoning ordinances provide for regulation of the appearance of buildings along major traffic thoroughfares or in scenic areas, or control of the architecture of buildings adjacent to civic centers or in areas of historical significance. Area regulations have been supplemented by the requirement that space for automobile parking or storage space shall be provided in connection with multiple residential uses, and in some places in all residential districts; and the requirement that loading and unloading space shall be provided for commercial and industrial uses.

The second expansion of zoning was an extension from its application within municipalities to its application to suburban areas under county jurisdiction. While this extension was primarily that of an urban type of

regulation to suburban areas, it frequently found itself faced by problems which had not generally been found in municipal zoning. For example, a residential area gradually "feathering out" into the open country might find its residential characteristics in the outer areas modified by agricultural uses such as chicken raising, not occurring in the more compactly developed inner areas. Thus new types of district classifications would be required. County zoning has also had to deal with the problem of controlling the uses which develop along traffic thoroughfares as the result of the traffic, first in suburban areas, then in the open country, and has been developing new principles of regulation that are beyond the limits of urban zoning formulae. Regulation of the location of roadside business uses and the control of automobile wrecking yards and of billboards, both to prevent hazards to traffic and to protect the scenery, are distinct contributions by county zoning.

The third expansion of zoning has been that of its application to non-urban land uses. This has grown out of broad studies of the most beneficial utilization of soil, forests and other natural resources. The districts established under this type of zoning deal primarily with agriculture, forestry and recreation. They may prevent settlement on land which cannot economically support agriculture or they may control agricultural practices which destroy the soil through erosion. This type of zoning operates in the field of land uses in the open country. We have seen that into the open country have also been extended types of regulation which are an expansion of urban zoning, such as the control of roadside uses and the protection of scenic areas. Thus, county zoning of an essentially urban character is meeting the non-urban type of county zoning and there must be developed a coordinated structure for the zoning plan which will comprehend both types.

Urban zoning has spread until over three-quarters of the urban population of the United States now live in zoned municipalities. The 1,700 zoned municipalities are found in all states and range from New York City, with its population of over seven million, to towns of a few hundred inhabitants.⁴ County zoning has proceeded more slowly than municipal zoning. County zoning regulations are in effect in suburban areas and in areas likely to be urbanized in only about thirty counties in ten states.⁵ Non-urban zoning regulations, such as those controlling agricultural uses, are in effect in only two states: Wisconsin, with about 35 counties having adopted such regulations, and Michigan, with two.⁶

While about 1,700 cities are zoned, there are over 16,000 municipalities in the United States, plus over 20,000 town and township governments in

⁴ Municipal zoning enabling legislation is now in effect in all states, but in twelve of these it applies only to specified classes of municipalities or to specified municipalities.

⁵ County zoning enabling legislation is in effect in sixteen states; in nine of these the statutes apply to all counties; in the others to specified counties.

⁶ Of the states which authorize county zoning, nine permit rural zoning; in six of these the statutes apply to all counties; in the others to specified counties.

the 23 states in which these occur. The less than 70 counties in which either urban or non-urban zoning regulations have been adopted do not make a very impressive total against the more than 3,000 counties in the United States.

In telling the story of how far we have come in zoning, it is necessary to take account of the shortcomings of much zoning as actually practiced. It is difficult to generalize in a field presenting such wide variations, but some broad observations can be made. Zoning officials are usually faced by some opposition in the formulation and adoption of a zoning plan in the first place, and by continuing efforts after adoption to break down its integrity by revisions in special cases. The initial opposition may result in a compromise plan; subsequent nibbling away both weakens the zoning structure and impairs the assurance of stability in land use which is an important benefit of zoning. Of the two, the latter is usually the more dangerous; a combination of the two may be disastrous. Many of the zoning ordinances adopted during the twenties and still in effect reflect the optimistic belief of that period that cities would continue to grow and expand at rates then prevailing and almost without limit. In my own state an important city adopted a zoning ordinance in 1924. It then had a population of about 120,000. The ordinance, prepared by competent planning consultants, was submitted with a report which stated that the zoning plan was scaled for "large increase in population," being based on the needs of a population of 400,000. Now, sixteen years later, the population is less than 140,000. In my native city in California it was estimated some years ago that the maximum possible future population, about six times the population at the time of the study, could support about eight miles of business frontage. At that time there were on the market 29 miles of business frontage and it was estimated that when the subdividing of the land in the city had been completed and zoning had been applied according to the current optimistic pattern, there would be 56 miles of business frontage available. A small midwestern city, with a population of 27,000 in 1920 and of 40,000 in 1930, had enough commercial frontage under its zoning ordinance to take care of 537,000 people.

With rare exceptions, zoning regulations throughout the country are woefully inadequate in their area and density requirements. In order to secure adequate light, air, privacy, and safety from fire hazard, dwellings should be at least as far apart laterally as their height to the highest point of a flat roof or to the midpoint of a pitched roof. Yet many zoning ordinances permit side yards as narrow as three feet, resulting in dwellings as close together as the spread of a man's arms, with practically complete deprivation of direct sunlight in side windows, with serious impairment of family privacy and with accentuation of fire hazard. Under many zoning ordinances an apartment house may be allowed to cover almost the total area of its lot. Such an apartment house is not simply borrowing the light and air of its neighbors; it is confiscating their light and air, with

no possibility of restoration. Population densities in multiple residential districts as high as 70 or even up to 100 or more families per acre are possible under many zoning ordinances, regardless of the fact that 40 families per acre is the maximum which should be tolerated under any circumstances, even in the heaviest multiple districts in the largest cities (and with the highest land values), and that fewer than 40 families per acre should be the limit in most of the multiple residential areas in most cities.

Thus far have we come and thus inadequate is much that we have done. Beyond these shortcomings most zoning ordinances fall short of their possibilities as instruments of positive direction of development. But in the recognition of this there is hope. It is a distinct advance that there is emerging throughout the country the realization that a zoning plan must do more than recognize the obvious and merely seek to prevent that which is clearly bad, and that it must be devised as a means toward the accomplishment of far-reaching objectives in community development. These objectives may not always be the end results of existing tendencies. It is likely that some of the existing tendencies are not sound and require redirection. The courts have long recognized the importance of the forward-looking aspect of zoning. Fifteen years ago a state supreme court said: "Zoning in its best sense looks not only backward to protect districts already established but forward to aid in the development of districts according to a comprehensive plan having as its basis the welfare of the city as a whole."⁷ In its forward-looking aspect zoning should be the detailed expression of a broad land-use and population-density pattern according to which the community shall develop. Nor is this function confined to new communities. Neither cities nor rural areas are static, but are always undergoing gradual change. Zoning must provide a guide for the change; and a pattern of development, or of redevelopment, is required for the established community even though this pattern must take more of its form from existing conditions than in a community which can be guided from the ground up. Obviously, the basic land-use pattern, while fundamental, cannot stand alone, but must be an integrated part of a complete physical pattern, covering the physical structure of the community, its physical facilities, the nature and extent of its land uses and the distribution and density of its population. Unless zoning is based on this broad foundation, it can do little more than deal with the obvious and must face the future of the community blindly.

Zoning cannot be regarded as a master plan, nor as a part of the master plan. The master plan is a basic physical pattern. It is expressed in broad and general terms. In zoning enabling acts the term "general location, character and extent" is frequently used to describe the form of the master plan. The very nature of zoning is incongruous with this "general char-

⁷ Zahn v. Board of Public Works, 195 Cal. 513.

acter" of the master plan. Zoning is precise and exact. Much confusion in thinking and practice can be avoided if zoning is correctly regarded as a measure of control which is invoked as one of the means used to make the master plan effective, to translate the master plan from a pattern and standards into reality. This conception of zoning will also lift zoning from merely a means of preventing obvious abuses to its greater usefulness as an instrument of direction.

In the realization of this we begin to find the answer as to how far we can go in zoning. It must first of all be recognized that we can go little further than we have thus far come unless zoning is applied as part of a comprehensive planning process, based on a comprehensive master plan.

It would be fatuous to attempt to indicate specifications as to how far we can go in zoning. However, it is possible to point out a number of specific types of regulation in which considerable advance is possible and may be expected.

Much more can undoubtedly be done than at present with regulations which are largely esthetic in purpose. Examples of this are control of the appearance of buildings along main traffic thoroughfares, in scenic areas and in the environs of public buildings and parks; control of the style of architecture of buildings adjacent to civic centers and in areas of historical significance; control of the design of buildings and of their display of signs in business districts, especially in neighborhood shopping centers; requirement of extensive setbacks, say two or three hundred feet, for large industrial uses in open areas, with possibly the requirement that existing natural cover in the space thus left shall be substantially maintained.

A few examples, found principally in California counties, on Long Island and in Arlington County, Virginia, indicate that the curse of billboards along the open roadsides and of sign infestations on business establishments along the roadsides and in neighborhood business districts can be eliminated. Billboards can be prohibited along the open roadsides, even in districts in which limited business uses for the service of the passing traffic are permitted, and these uses themselves can be strictly limited in their display of signs. The examples of regulations accomplishing these purposes illustrate how far we have come in a few places and indicate an advance which should be made on the broad front of zoning.

It is not likely that regulation of the appearance of buildings can or should be extended generally to dwellings in residential areas. But where a dwelling would be markedly incongruous with the character of the neighborhood, it may be possible to prevent its establishment there. Most zoning enabling acts provide that zoning regulations shall be made "with reasonable consideration, among other things, of the character of the district . . . and with a view to conserving the value of buildings." A dwelling which is greatly different in size or appearance from dwellings prevailing in the neighborhood might conceivably be as detrimental to the neighborhood as would some retail business use. Whether definite stand-

ards for determining or measuring "incongruity" can be devised, or whether the issuance of a building permit for an obviously incongruous dwelling should be left to the discretion of the board of appeals upon reference by the administrative officer, can be determined only after considerable experimenting. In this principle, however applied, may lie part of the answer as to what to do with shacks which seek to intrude into good residential neighborhoods. But there are two sides to the problem. Housing for low-income families must be provided somewhere: It should be adequate housing, provided in accordance with a housing plan, as a part of the master plan. The detriment occurring to a good residential neighborhood by reason of the intrusion of shacks is outweighed by the social detriment of forcing the families housed in the shacks to find their housing in slum areas. Thus, protection of the "better" neighborhoods must be balanced by the assurance of adequate housing for all families.

Nonconforming uses can be eliminated. A nonconforming use has not established a vested right by which it must be permitted to remain forever in its location unless it burns down or is abandoned. The only right which a nonconforming use has is the right to the reasonable enjoyment of the investment which it represents. (This is assuming that the use is not a nuisance per se, subject to abatement as such.) This right is protected if the nonconforming use is allowed to continue during a reasonable time in which the investment will be amortized. Rules should be devised for determining what this period of time is for various types of structures. Possibly the board of appeals should participate in administering the regulations. The problem is much simpler with nonconforming uses of land, not involving permanent buildings, and with such uses as billboards and automobile wrecking yards, which do not represent substantial investments or which can readily be moved. Any of these latter nonconforming uses can be eliminated by allowing them a reasonable time, say from six months to a year or so, depending on the nature of the use, in which to find other locations, if possible, and to move to them.

The way has already been well pointed to the requirement of off-street automobile parking space. There is no doubt that this can be required for all new residential uses, multiple or otherwise. Within limitations imposed by existing patterns of business and industrial districts, it can also be required for new uses in these districts. Business and industrial uses on parcels of any considerable size can be required to provide loading and unloading space off the street.

There is need for a type of retail business district classification under which the business districts will be carefully designed, including not only traffic access, space for automobile standing, loading and unloading space, and control of the display of signs, but also the architecture of the buildings, with the provision that business uses shall be permitted only in complete conformity with the design.

There has been considerable discussion of flood plain zoning and it

can be expected that progress will be made in regulations of this type, under which areas which are subject to periodic or frequent overflow will be closed to uses which would be damaged by such overflow and which would impose on the community as a whole burdens for rescue, relief and rehabilitation. The permitted uses in flood plain areas may range from purely open land uses, such as crop agriculture, to some types of heavy industrial uses, such as storage yards which can readily be vacated if necessary.

Zoning can probably be used to protect watersheds, not only to prevent the contamination of domestic water supplies, but to prevent excessive runoff and consequent flood damage. Likewise, zoning can be used to prevent methods of soil cultivation which result in erosion.

The validity of advances in the foregoing types of regulation depends on the comprehensiveness of the regulations themselves and of the zoning plan of which they are a part. But more than this, the extent to which they can go, and to a considerable degree their validity, depend on the comprehensiveness and the soundness of the underlying master plan on which the zoning plan is based. And in considering zoning as an instrument of planning, we can go beyond a listing of specific items of regulation in which advances can be made, and can give attention to the accomplishment of the broad objectives of the master plan.

One of the most important advances which should be made in zoning is to achieve a more certain and more comprehensive control of density of population and intensity of land use. The density standards of most existing zoning ordinances are those of expediency or those which simply try to prevent anything worse than that which has already happened. What is required is a comprehensive land-use and population-density pattern, in which the structure of the entire community will be set forth in proper balance, with zoning serving as a detailed specification and application of this underlying pattern. If this calls for reducing a permitted population density in a multiple residential area from eighty families per acre to forty, or twenty, or less than this, let it be done. If it calls for a density of one family per five acres, let this also be done. Neither regulation might be able to stand if compartmentalized by itself, but they, and all between them, can stand as together constituting an instrument for the accomplishment of the objectives of the underlying plan. Under housing regulations which prevent overcrowding, and within specified ranges of levels of family income, it may be possible to express density requirements in zoning in terms of the sizes of the dwelling units, thus achieving some control of the density in terms of numbers of persons rather than of numbers of families.⁸

The underlying land-use and population-density pattern must be more than a fabricated design which merely takes account of topography, past

⁸ Arlington County, Virginia, is now experimenting with such regulations.

développement, means of transportation and apparent trends in land use. It must be designed to serve the needs and habits of the people of the community. It must take account of the economic base of the community, of the reflection of that economic base in the economic character of the community as represented in levels of family income and in the structure of property values, and it must take account of the social and cultural characteristics of the community. It must consider space standards not only in terms of light and air, but also in terms of the effects of urban clausturation on fertility rates and on the biological sufficiency of urban populations.

There is also need for the development of sound principles for controlling the intensity of the use of the land in business districts. Such control is now accomplished to some extent by means of height and bulk regulations: It is obvious that there is a lower intensity of use if the height limit is three stories than if the floor area of the building can equal fifty times the lot area. The purpose of height and bulk regulations in business districts should be not only the preservation of light and air but the providing of a proper distribution of uses in relation to the design of the business district, both as to its use and as to its physical structure. Thus far, consideration of the proper distribution of business district uses has related principally to the traffic capacities of streets. There is a broad field of functional design of business districts yet to be explored. When it comes to equalizing the "development load" on the land in relation to business district design, the best that has been done thus far in zoning has been to establish height and bulk limits which may be less than the heights and bulks which would have occurred in the absence of regulation, but which, except in rare instances, do little more than just that. There is a lack of adequate scientific information as to the factors entering into the aggregate results of the use-density of the business district on traffic capacities within the district, and as to desirable functional and use-density patterns. Daytime "population" per use varies widely among various uses, and the population turnover per use varies still more. Until exhaustive research, far more extensive than anything thus far undertaken, has unraveled some of the complexities of the problem, and until a coordinated method of control has been worked out (involving tax policy as well as zoning regulations) height and bulk limitations beyond those necessary to assure adequate light and air are largely arbitrary. Mean-time, zoning in practice can do little more than prescribe apparently reasonable "envelopes of open space" for buildings in the districts of most intensive use. But at the same time means should be sought for extensive research looking toward the establishment of sound principles for the control of use-density. These principles, and the general patterns resulting from them, should be embodied in the master plan and zoning regulations should be devised to accomplish their purposes.

A second important use of zoning as an instrument of planning is in

the rehabilitation of deteriorating and blighted areas. Much of the zoning in practice has tended to accelerate blight. It has set high density standards allowing further overcrowding in areas already deteriorated because of overcrowding. It has multiplied the detriment of the undesirable situation of residential property adjacent to major traffic thoroughfares by excessive zoning for business purposes. It has zoned deteriorated residential neighborhoods for industrial uses, simply because they were deteriorated and without regard to the possibility of general industrialization, and has thus destroyed what residential values remained. In deteriorating neighborhoods zoning may accomplish not only a valuable protective function by delaying the forces of decay and preserving existing use values for a much longer period than would otherwise be possible, but can look ahead to the future use of the neighborhood in the general structure of the community and can apply regulations which will best guide a changing use pattern. Here, again, regulations which could not stand by themselves take on an importance by which they are justified, if they are designed to accomplish the purposes of an underlying master plan. There would seem to be no reason why regulations, skillfully designed and operating gradually, could not be used to effect a complete change of use, such as from industrial to residential. The service of the public welfare as represented by a comprehensive master plan is of powerful effect in lending validity to regulations which, if isolated, would be arbitrary, capricious and ineffective.

A third advance which can be made in employing zoning as an instrument of planning is to use it as an implement for the protection of planned rights-of-way (either new rights-of-way or the widening of existing rights-of-way) and of land recommended for public use, according to the underlying master plan. In some states planned rights-of-way may be protected by the adoption of an official map; in others by the adoption of "precise plans" based on the master plan. In other states there is no separate statutory procedure for the protection of planned rights-of-way, and there should be no good reason in these states for not establishing these future right-of-way lines as a part of zoning. They thus become simply an additional regulation of the location of buildings (in addition to the regulation of their location under yard and area requirements) for the purpose of effectuating a part of the master plan. Regulation of the locations of buildings through yard and area requirements is for the purpose of assisting in the effectuation of the land-use and population-density pattern and the community design standards of the master plan. The adoption of the lines of future rights-of-way is for the purpose of assisting in effectuating the street and highway part of the master plan, and in some respects there is distinct advantage in including them in the zoning plan, for thereby yard requirements can more readily be adjusted to them. In the legal effect of the establishment of the lines of future rights-of-way,

zoning should operate in the same way as the adoption of an official map or of the precise lines of future rights-of-way under special statutory procedure: No buildings or other permanent improvements should be permitted within such lines, with, however, the customary procedure for the granting of variances in cases of practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship.

Generally, no such clear-cut results can be obtained in dealing with land areas required for other types of public use, such as for park and other recreation purposes, public building sites and other uses requiring substantial parcels of land. Protection of planned rights-of-way may require little more than a building setback; protection of sizable areas required for public use, if complete, would usually operate to prevent a reasonable use of the land. However, it may be possible to accomplish a partial limitation of use pending public acquisition of the land. The limitation might be either of the nature of use or of the intensity of use, or both. The extent to which this could be done would probably depend largely on the general intensity of use in the area of which the land in question is a part. In an agricultural area it would doubtless be possible to prevent any building construction on lands along water courses recommended by the master plan for future park or parkway use. In an area of intensive urban development the limitation could not be so great. If the land in question were situated within a commercial or industrial area, it would not be possible, for instance, to require that it should be used only for residential purposes. However, the use might be limited to predominantly open-land commercial and industrial uses (again, with adjustment possible in cases of unnecessary hardship). The choice is simpler if the general area of which the land is a part is as yet undeveloped, with the decision to be made as to the degree of intensity of use to be permitted under the zoning ordinance. There the underlying master plan, if it is comprehensive and competent, may possess a power sufficient to dictate that the land in question should be zoned for a low intensity type of use, even though the trends of development indicate that the general area of which the land is a part may be subject to future development of a greater intensity.

Another example of regulations designed to protect a part of the master plan is the establishment of height limits applying to buildings adjacent to airports. Such height limitations, standing by themselves, might be of doubtful validity, but if the location of the airport under consideration is in accord with a master plan, it takes on a significance which justifies regulations designed for the protection of the airport. Such height limits should properly be included in the zoning plan, since there is no reason for imposing two sets of regulations applying to the heights of buildings and other structures, one the district regulations of the zoning plan and the other special height limits around airports. The height limits other-

wise in effect in the districts surrounding the airport under consideration should be modified by the height limitations which are required for the safe use of the airport.

A fourth advance in the use of zoning as an instrument of planning is in the application of use and density control to prevent scattered urban expansion and premature urban development. The land-use and population-density pattern of the master plan, if it is to be competent, cannot be confined to the political boundaries of municipalities. If the municipality is a part of a metropolitan area, the plan must extend to the entire metropolitan area. If it stands more or less alone, the plan must extend at least to the area which is rather closely related to the municipality economically and socially. The land-use and population-density plan will not indicate a static pattern, but should indicate, in an area which is subject to population increase or in which the economic base is changing, areas which are subject to immediate urban development and those which are ultimately subject to such development, insofar as this can be determined. It is recognized that these are relative terms, but they can be somewhat defined in relation to the curve of probable population change or to the change in community pattern which is likely to result from a change in the economic base of the community. The underlying land-use plan will thus indicate areas which are subject to expanding urban development within a reasonable period of time, based on the rate of population change, the nature of economic change, and the estimated rate of utilization of land for various types of major land use. Scattered urban expansion beyond such areas, frequently as a result of land speculation, unbalances a normal and orderly extension of utility and other services and results either in excessive cost per unit for such services or inadequate provision of them. Such scattered uses also tend to disrupt the land valuation structures of the areas in which the intrusions occur.

A major method of dealing with the problem of scattered urban expansion is the adequate control of subdivisions, covering not only the design of the subdivision and the requirement that the subdivider shall provide street improvements and utility services, but the requirement that he shall prove that there is an actual public necessity for the subdivided property. Zoning can supplement this method of control and it can also deal with scattered urban expansion which occurs apart from subdividing.

One method is to prescribe a large minimum area for building sites in a wide belt around the community, thus preventing development on a small-lot basis. If the underlying land-use plan is valid, and if its objectives are clearly and honestly stated, there is no reason why the building site area and occupancy standards should not be such, for instance, as will permit only an agricultural use. The use regulations of the zoning ordinance should prescribe either a one-family residential use or a combined one-family residential and agricultural use. Such regulations should be cross-tied with the subdivision control regulations, so that the minimum

lot area prescribed in the zoning ordinance shall also be the minimum lot area to which land can be subdivided. As normal and orderly urban expansion takes place within the area available for it, the open belt can be progressively moved farther out to permit the urban development of new areas. This procedure will not limit the territorial expansion of cities, but will at least assure that such expansion as does occur shall take place in an orderly manner, and will lessen the conflicts among uses which arise in extensive and shifting areas of transition from open-land uses to urban uses.

Thus far have we come in zoning: at least to the point where we begin to realize that zoning must be an instrument of planning if it is to justify itself as more than an expedient measure. Thus far can we go in zoning: as far as zoning will reasonably serve the purposes of the underlying master plan upon which it is based. Thus far have we come: to where we find that we hold in our hands an instrument of greater power and with a sharper cutting edge than we had realized. Thus far can we go: as far as we are able skillfully to use this instrument for the service of human welfare as represented in the broad purposes of the master plan.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

REPORTER: Irvin J. McCrary, *Consultant, Colorado State Planning Commission.*

DISCUSSION LEADERS: Myron D. Downs, *Engineer-Secretary, Cincinnati City Planning Commission.*

P. Hetherton, *Executive Officer, Washington State Planning Council.*

John T. Howard, *Technical Officer, Regional Association of Cleveland.*

Frank F. Stearns, *Executive Secretary, City Planning Board, Miami, Florida.*

Joshua H. Vogel, *Planning Engineer, King County Planning Commission, Washington.*

Those discussing Mr. Pomeroy's paper concurred in his conclusions, but added many interesting comments and observations on the progress of zoning in different parts of the country.

Mr. Downs suggested that much confusion of thought will be avoided if zoning is regarded as one of the means for making the master plan effective. Through zoning we attempt to cast the mould for urban and suburban areas and give shape to our communities. Four inventions have brought about, first the necessity for zoning, and second, the kind of zoning which we now have developed. These are the electric motor, Portland cement, the gasoline engine, and structural steel. It is such things

as these which have made possible the city of our times. Zoning must be flexible, for we cannot predict what changes in our city structures will be brought about by future inventions. Invention of the airplane is already having its influence. The speaker agreed with Mr. Pomeroy that we can go no farther in zoning than the thinking of representative groups and than the extent to which they show a disposition to fight for their objectives. The necessity for citizen organization to support planning and zoning was properly emphasized.

Mr. Hetherton described the activities of county planning commissions in the state of Washington following the passage of an enabling act in 1935 for city and county planning and zoning. Some of the county planning commissions have continued to function, while others have fallen by the wayside, either because of a lack of available technical assistance or a lack of money with which to employ such assistance. Those which are still active are getting into the field of rural land zoning. When this form of zoning was discovered the boards were anxious to use it immediately, but instead of first building up a comprehensive plan, the tendency was to zone for the purpose of freezing or of correcting existing conditions. It is questionable whether public opinion at the time was sufficiently educated actually to support rural land zoning regulations. One metropolitan county made the mistake of copying an ordinance and naturally encountered difficulty in applying the regulations; now it must be amended to fit local needs. Still other counties had various problems such as protection of the frontage along a new highway and disposition of cut-over and tax-delinquent lands. In the matter of flood plain zoning the state has taken control, instead of the county planning commissions, under authority of a law enacted after serious flood damage. Accomplishments under this state law are satisfactory and the regulations are being enforced. It seems likely that rural land zoning may be advanced by cooperation with the agricultural land-use committees. These committees are helpful in developing public opinion for the support of rational zoning.

Mr. Howard again emphasized the necessity of basing a zoning plan upon the master plan. The master plan is general in character, while the zoning ordinance is by nature precise and exact. The best procedure requires the three following steps: (1) prepare a master land-use plan; (2) frame the zoning ordinance in conformity with the master plan; and (3) bring the zoning ordinance into control over the use of the land. Too often zoning in this country has been regarded as static. If the master plan is organic and subject to change, zoning must be equally flexible in order to meet new conditions. It was suggested that we consider the procedure in England whereby in undeveloped areas urban development is suspended until such time as the area is considered ripe for subdivision and building. This device of course does not apply to the zoning of existing urban centers.

Mr. Stearns, contending that there are exceptions to all good rules,

reported on the experience of Miami, Florida, in adopting zoning restrictions involving cost and type of building construction. In this city they had felt that this was necessary for the protection of values in residential areas, for petitions were frequently received from people in unrestricted areas requesting restrictions on their own properties.

Mr. Vogel cited the experience of King County, Washington, where the people's active interest in and desire for zoning has, for the most part, kept pace with the concept of the technicians. Because that is so, zoning efforts have been successful in the rural areas. Perhaps the chief problem in King County has been finding adequate standards for population density. The city of Seattle has been less successful in that than have the suburban and rural districts where the people themselves have formed their own local planning committees and submitted advice, maps and even suggested zoning regulations to the commission. They have been particularly anxious to maintain the conditions in the rural areas which first attracted them away from the congested sections of Seattle. Under the impetus of the people's interest, the commission has come far in collecting facts necessary to a progressive zoning program, in recognizing the errors in the original regulations, and in developing proper planning and zoning methods. One of the difficult problems still to be solved is the enforcement of regulations prohibiting residences on land zoned for forestry. Mr. Vogel feels that zoning in King County can continue effectively to meet new problems as they arise and to follow and improve on zoning precedents already established, just as long as the people continue to have a vital understanding of the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Aaron B. Horwitz called attention to the fact that there are not more than half as many planning commissions as there are zoning boards, and that as a result there arises the problem of keeping zoning up to date. Zoning is apt to become merely an attempt to protect the community from nuisances when it is not geared to the activities of a planning board. As such, it falls short of the concept presented by Mr. Pomeroy. Mr. Wallace C. Penfield was of the opinion that many zoning ordinances are adopted with evangelistic fervor aroused over some particularly bad example and giving little consideration to any master plan. In such cases the dangerous time comes a little later, when the evangelists are out of the picture and there comes a clamor for variances and amendments. This situation can be avoided where the planning board is active and subjects the zoning ordinance to frequent re-examination.

Mr. John Nolen, Jr., in his discussion, agrees that it is the people themselves, not the courts or the technicians, who are unwilling to see zoning advance beyond the average front line which Mr. Pomeroy visualizes. He suggests two reasons for their reluctance: first, an over-emphasis on the rights of the individual as opposed to the welfare of the community growing out of world threats to individual liberty and out of economic stress; and secondly, lack of confidence in the integrity of zoning in the

face of the record in communities where zoning ordinances have been badly administered. Our own democratic system in its attempt to preserve itself may well tend to place more emphasis on community needs, as distinct from immediate individual rights, a tendency which will reduce this kind of opposition to zoning. While the planners may not have much influence in this matter, they can and should do much toward maintaining the integrity of the zoning plan by urging review and modernization of the zoning ordinance, and by relating it to the community master plan. Such measures would restore the comprehensive character which the zoning plan had before impairment by improper amendments. As examples of the harm done through lack of correlation between legislative, planning and administrative spheres, Mr. Nolen cites examples of towns where the planning commissions have had no influence whatever over the actions of the zoning boards and where there are ineffective boards of appeal. In one town lacking such effective controls, a well prepared zoning plan was largely nullified within a year's time by amendments made during a building boom.

Examples such as this point to the necessity of increasing efforts on the part of planners and citizens' organizations effectively to marshal public sentiment in favor of proper zoning and to counteract the pressures of special interests. Too, enlightened self-interest among progressive business and investment groups should be fostered.

If we are to continue to advance, extensive research must be undertaken on what the experience of the last twenty-five years has been, particularly in regard to the relation of zoning to land values and assessment policies, population shifts, blighted areas, and economic and technical bases for density standards that are acceptable to progressive investment interests.

A weakness of most of the zoning ordinances has been the lack of relationship to a comprehensive community plan, and the resulting necessity for amendments. It is on the consolidation of this relationship that the future of zoning depends. Zoning is an advancing technique, the power of which to control the future of our communities is appreciated more and more.

Regional Industrial Trends and the Pacific Northwest

PAUL J. RAVER *

*Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration
United States Department of the Interior*

In recent years the major regional industrial trends, relative to population, have consisted of advances in the central states around the Great Lakes, in the Southern states, and in California, while declines occurred in New England and in the Middle Atlantic states. No adequate study has yet been made of the processes involved in these trends affecting new industries and old industries, new firms and old firms. Conscious planning has played a negligible role in influencing regional trends although in the past few years there has been a growth of promotional activities among communities, states, and regions. The only effectively organized regional development is that directed by the TVA in favor of the South.

Among the larger factors affecting regional development have been the increase of barriers to industries erected by states and the growth of inducements offered by communities and states. More fundamental have been interregional differences in freight rates on manufactured products and differences in wage rates. Less obvious influences have included the lack of organized information about regional industrial opportunities and the pressures of monopolistic groups.

The Pacific Northwest has only begun to appear as a new region of potential industrial growth. Its extremely underdeveloped industrial status will probably be ameliorated to some extent by population expansion stimulated through the irrigation project at Grand Coulee, and by the attraction of electrochemical and electrometallurgical industries to the largest new supply of low-cost electric power in the country. Northwest development, however, is handicapped by the lack of a regional coordinating and promotional agency.

Had our peace-time industrial evolution been permitted to continue, it is likely that we would have recognized shortly the need for eliminating conflicts and waste in regional industrial developments through national and regional guidance. The urgencies caused by our shift to a defense economy leave open the desirability of regional defense boards that could become the predecessors in the future of regional industrial boards.

* With the collaboration of Samuel Moment, Economist, Market Development Section.

A few months ago this discussion of regional aspects of national industrial development could have concentrated on problems of a peace economy. The industrial economics of national defense would have been of growing but subsidiary importance. Today, the position is reversed. Our regional industrial trends are being moulded toward serving the purposes of national defense or a war economy. The billions of dollars that are now being spent in this country by foreign buyers and the additional billions they may spend, together with our own expenditures, will clearly overshadow and probably displace some of the current industrial developments in our peace economy. Whether the war abroad ends this year or continues for some time, it seems evident that military economics will increasingly affect us for some years.

Under these circumstances, perhaps the most useful purpose that this discussion may serve would be to view the Northwest within the highlights of recent regional trends in industrial development, to indicate the most significant influences on these trends, and to relate them to the adjustments that now appear likely. While this is broad ground and can only be sketched in the time allowed, it seems more appropriate, at this time of change from a peace economy to a defense economy, that instead of concentrating on the problems of the Northwest, we view them in the perspective of national fundamentals.

Regional trends in manufactures: The national trend in the number of manufacturing wage earners has been downward since 1919. Three regions have moved counter to the trend if we take the year 1937 as our point of final measurement. In that year, the number of wage earners exceeded any previously reported year—including 1929—in the East North Central states around the Great Lakes,¹ in the South including the South Atlantic² and the East South Central states,³ and in the Pacific Coast states. All the gain on the Pacific Coast was concentrated in California, and that state may be regarded as a region in itself.

But more significant than the trends in the number of wage earners are the trends when related to population. If we take as an index of regional manufactures, wage earners per 1,000 population in each region as a percentage of the national average,⁴ we find rising trends in the regions already mentioned and the most important declining trends in the New England and Middle Atlantic states.⁵

As the regions stood in 1937, the index of manufacturing wage earners as a percentage of the national average was still high in the East, being 177

¹ Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin.

² Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida.

³ Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi.

⁴ Another measure could be based on value added per capita; the results would not be materially different. See appended tables 1 and 2.

⁵ New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania.

per cent in New England and 131 per cent in the Middle Atlantic states. The East North Central states were at a level of 149 per cent. Those below the national average but coming up were the South Atlantic states at 87 per cent, the East South Central states at 53 per cent, and California at 75 per cent. The other regions were either declining or showing no clear trends. The Pacific Northwest—Idaho, Washington, and Oregon—showed no definite trend, and its index in 1937 was 86 per cent and slightly below the index for 1929. This index of 86 per cent does not indicate a reasonably developed industrial status when it is recalled that the Northwest is annually supplying over 40 per cent of the value of lumber and timber products produced in the United States. Altogether, the wood products industries in the Northwest accounted in 1937 for 63 per cent of the manufacturing wage earners of the region. If we remove them from the comparison, the adjusted index of manufacturing wage earners in the Northwest, relative to population, was only 36 per cent of the national average.

Processes in regional trends: In the expansion and contraction of various regions, certain processes of location have been taking place, some involving industries making products already known, others involving industries making new products. The major processes affecting old industries have been (1) the branching of existing plants into other regions, (2) the establishment in some regions of new firms competing with old firms of other regions, (3) the expansion of the business of existing firms at the expense of existing firms in other regions—that is, the normal effects of interregional competition, (4) the physical migration of a few plants and their managements through closing down in one region and reopening in another, and (5) the displacement of the products of old firms by entirely new products made in other regions by new industries.

The effects of new industries, of course, have been outstanding. Where the new products have displaced old products, one region may have benefited at the expense of another. Thus, the expansion of rayon textiles in the South has been a partial cause of the decline of cotton textiles in New England. Where the new products have provided entirely new services, not materially displacing old goods, the expansion has not injured other regions. Such has been the case of airplane manufacture in Southern California.

I have stressed these processes of location because we need more information on how they have been working out in various industries and how they have been affecting various regions. The study of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company for the years 1926 and 1927⁶ indicated that the establishment of new firms and branch plants of old firms was far more

⁶ *Industrial Development in the United States and Canada, 1926 and 1927*, Civic Development Committee of the National Electric Light Association and the Policyholders Service Bureau of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company.

numerous than relocations of old firms. But these findings were not comprehensively analyzed and might not apply to the same extent in recent years.

Promotional influences upon regional trends: In the evolution of these regional industrial movements conscious planning has played a negligible role. The most apparent factors in the expansion of the Middle West, California, and the South, partly at the expense of the New England and Middle Atlantic states, have been the changing distribution of population and the shifts of workable natural resources. The special role of low labor costs in the South is also well recognized.⁷ The descriptions of how these factors have exerted their influences, their mutual interrelations, and the complications supplied by other factors⁸ are not reducible to a few generalizations. The one obvious observation we may make is that regional industrial planning was absent. It was not needed when the major pre-occupations of the country were to explore resources and invent new products and technologies—to find out what we could do with what we had.

But within the past few years, the federal government, groups of states, individual states, and local chambers of commerce have employed more consciously various measures to influence regional trends. On the national level, federal policy has begun to affect directly the South and the Northwest. Through the Tennessee Valley Authority, measures are being taken that will materially further the industrial development of the Central Southern states. General measures of the TVA in effecting lower power costs, controlling soil erosion, contributing to the navigability of the Tennessee River, sustaining the forests, and guiding farming methods will increase the general income of the affected states and their accessibility to outside markets. They will be able to buy more industrial products, manufacture more for their own markets, and sell elsewhere more of what they produce. Specific measures of the TVA in developing fertilizers, designing special agricultural machinery, promoting research on frozen foods, plastics, china clay, and other products have already encouraged private capital to initiate new private industries.⁹

In the Northwest, some industrial expansion should result from the national policy of developing multi-purposes of the Columbia River through measures of flood control, irrigation, inland waterway, and low-cost power developments. But the problems of expansion are complicated

⁷ Daniel B. Creamer and Hermann K. Brunck, *Pattern of Industrial Location* in Carter Goodrich and others, *Migration and Economic Opportunity*, p. 317; Frederic B. Garver, Francis M. Boddy, Alvar J. Nixon, *The Location of Manufactures in the United States, 1899-1929*, pp. 167, 234; Tracy E. Thompson, *Location of Manufactures, 1899-1929*, p. 14.

⁸ Glenn E. McLaughlin, *Growth of American Manufacturing Areas*, Ch. 5; National Resources Committee, *The Structure of the American Economy*, p. 41.

⁹ *TVA, Its Work and Accomplishments*; David E. Lilienthal, address on *The Restoration of Economic Equality Between Regions of the United States*, before the Southern Newspaper Publishers' Association, Mineral Wells, Texas, May 21, 1940; and *Business Week*, May 25, 1940, pp. 26-32.

at present by the absence of any coordinating regional agency. I shall defer this subject to the last part of this discussion.

On the regional level, we have seen the efforts of two groups of states to promote their industrial development. The New England states have had some of their common problems studied and their industrial interests publicized by the New England Council since 1925. The Southeastern states have protected and advertised their interests through the Southern States Industrial Council formed in 1933 and through the more recent Southern Governors' Council. The activities of these groups have included participation in freight rate cases, advocating federal and state legislation respecting taxes and labor, engaging in or promoting research affecting industrial development, and encouraging business men and chambers of commerce in industrial promotion. We do not know how effective their activities have been in maintaining or extending the amount of manufactures within their regions.

From the individual states, a barrage of promotional literature has been issued in recent years. Among the typical pamphlets, Arkansas is advertised by its Centennial Commission as "A New Industrial Horizon," and "A Strategic Site for Decentralization." Pennsylvania is described by its Department of Commerce as "The Keystone of Industry." The Division of State Publicity of Indiana proclaims that Indiana is "The Center of Almost Everything," and demonstrates by drawing around the state a circle that contains 90 per cent of the population of the nation. Pennsylvania in its pamphlet draws a more modest circle, but Arkansas draws a series of circles, and the outermost one includes the entire country. Among other states recently advertising their industrial advantages are New Jersey, Illinois, and Mississippi.

The cities also are participating in this movement although their efforts are part of the long-established promotional work of their chambers of commerce.

Barriers and inducements to industries: Far more significant than promotional publicity have been the actions of many states and communities to encourage local industries through the erection of barriers to trade from other states and through subsidies, tax concessions, and other inducements. The subject of trade barriers is receiving analysis in the Marketing Laws Survey of the Work Projects Administration, and pressures to reduce them are originating through the Council of State Governments.¹⁰ While many of these trade barriers have arisen in connection with agricultural products, a few particularly affect manufactures. These barriers include the anti-oleomargarine laws, a variety of laws designed to encourage local liquor industries, and laws giving preference to state building materials and state products used in state institutions.

A complementary policy to the erection of barriers appears in the grow-

¹⁰ *Proceedings of the National Conference on Interstate Trade Barriers*, April 5, 6, 7, 1939, The Council of State Governments.

ing number of inducements and tax concessions to industries offered both by states and communities. Inducements have included free factories and sites, cash bonuses, and participation in financing capital needs.¹¹ Tax concessions have an old history originating in New England after the Revolutionary War, and they have now been widely adopted in the Southern states.¹² Most notable among industrial programs was that of Mississippi to balance agriculture with industry, in effect from 1936 to June 1 of this year. Under the Industrial Act of 1936, cities and counties could finance and operate new industries which would be tax-exempt for five years. The results of this program through June of 1939 were the addition of ten new industries creating jobs for about 4,000 persons. The program was allowed to die because of opposition by a new governor to subsidizing private industry with public funds.¹³

No clear-cut appraisal of the over-all effects of inducements and tax concessions upon regional industrial trends has been made, and the practical difficulties would be very great in conducting a survey to form such an appraisal.¹⁴ Inconclusive results were obtained in surveys made by the city of New York and the Pennsylvania legislature,¹⁵ and a study for Massachusetts by the Commission on Interstate Cooperation found offers of inducements to emigrating plants to be a minor factor in the industrial decline of the state.¹⁶ Of course, in the case of migrating enterprises or new industries considering various locations, those that carefully appraise alternative costs of doing business would be influenced by tax concessions and other inducements provided these gains were not offset by other higher costs.

Effects of interregional differences in basic costs: Most fundamental upon regional differences in industrial development have been the influences of the basic costs of transportation to markets and wage rates. The artificial nature of the interterritorial and intraterritorial freight rate structure applicable to manufactured goods has been pointed out by the Tennessee Valley Authority.¹⁷ This structure, the result of historical evolution rather than costs of transportation, has given the Northeastern states, bounded by the Mississippi and Ohio rivers and the Atlantic Coast, advantages in shipping into other regions at lower rates, distance considered, than rates applicable to shipments within other regions. Like-

¹¹ Chamber of Commerce of the United States, *Special Inducements to Industries*, 1931, and *Community Industrial Financing Plans*, undated.

¹² National Association of Assessing Officers, *Exemption and Preferential Taxation of Factories*, 1939.

¹³ *Business Week*, April 13, 1940.

¹⁴ Harold M. Groves, *The Effect of Tax Differentials and Tax Exemption Upon The Relocation of Industry*, Proceedings of the National Tax Association, October 24-28, 1938, and Tax Policy League, *Tax Policy*, October, 1937.

¹⁵ Tax Policy League, *op. cit.*

¹⁶ Final Report of the Commission on Interstate Cooperation to the General Court concerning the Migration of Industrial Establishments from Massachusetts, 1939.

¹⁷ *The Interterritorial Freight Rate Problem of the United States*, 1937.

wise, the Eastern states have enjoyed rates within their territory lower than those applying to shipments over equal distances from other regions into the East. The general effects have been those of a protective tariff against shipments of manufactured products into the East from other regions, and a subsidy to the East in shipping into other regions. Thus, an historical development, not until recently given the attention it deserved, has long operated to restrict industrial growth outside of the Eastern or official freight-rate territory.

Now, however, national attention is being focused upon the problem. An opening wedge was driven to force freight-rate readjustments on manufactured goods from the South to the North as a result of the Southern rate case, initiated in May 1937, and decided by the Interstate Commerce Commission in November 1939. The decision was not clear-cut, being five to four with two commissioners not participating, and the line of reasoning was certainly not consistent, as pointed out by dissenting Commissioner Eastman.¹⁸ However, an opening was gained toward reconsideration of the entire rate structure on manufactured goods, and in July of 1939 the Interstate Commerce Commission ordered a comprehensive investigation of the interterritorial freight rate structure.

It would thus appear that if political pressure from all states outside the Eastern territory plus the inherently sound economics of the issue are ultimately to prevail, the South and the West will gain a relative reduction in the costs of shipping manufactured goods, both within their boundaries and to the East, and some stimulus should result to their industrial growth.

Another readjustment in regional differences in manufacturing costs has more definitely begun through the effects of the Fair Labor Standards Act on wage rates. The effects of this act are to raise labor costs in the South relative to the North and West, perhaps offsetting to some extent the gains the South may obtain in freight rate adjustments. Analysis of the number of wage earners in manufacturing industries covered by the act receiving less than 30 cents an hour in April 1939, shows that in all regions other than the South, less than five per cent of the employees were affected by the first wage increase required under the act. But in the South Atlantic states the percentage was 17, in the East South Central states it was 27, and in the West South Central states it was 22.¹⁹ Extension of the provisions of the act in the future will continue to affect the South more than other regions.

Another great change in regional cost differences involves electric power, and affects the Northwest favorably. The wholesale rates of the Bonneville Power Administration are now the lowest in the nation, and if the power to be generated at Grand Coulee is sold at similar levels, the

¹⁸ Interstate Commerce Commission, Docket 27746, decided November 22, 1939.

¹⁹ Derived from *Estimated Number of Workers in April, 1939, Subject to Provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act Effective October 24, 1939*, United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Northwest will have a decided advantage in competing for a special group of electrochemical and electrometallurgical industries—those in which the cost of power ranges from 10 to 50 per cent of the selling price of the final product. As I shall point out shortly, in no other region of the country is there available any new supply of power comparable in amount and cost to that of the Northwest.

Less obvious influences: There is another set of influences upon regional development that has not received much attention. First, there is a lack of information in many regions regarding their industrial potentialities. They lack knowledge of the extent of their internal markets for manufactured goods that they now import from other regions, knowledge of their resources and of the variety of ways to utilize them. Regional capital ordinarily hasn't sufficient information to appraise many industrial investments that are economically feasible. The orthodox economic theory that capital is mobile and readily moves into new opportunities is not realistic today. Mobility and aggressiveness were obvious characteristics of capital as the population moved westward accompanied by a wave of technological advances and new investments. Now it takes much more investigation, ranging from the work of research departments of large corporations to the marketing services of advertising and engineering agencies, to disclose markets and sound investment opportunities.

Second, there are the interests of monopolistic groups and large investments in one region that restrain competition from developing in other regions, even if such competition were to be confined to supplying only the markets of those regions. For example, the markets for tin plate in the Western states and territories amount to over 400,000 tons annually, of which less than 10 per cent is supplied from one small mill in California. Under present conditions of a concentrated market controlled by two can companies and the supply to that market dominated by two steel producers, it would be a hazardous enterprise for an independent steel company to establish a large tin plate mill on the Pacific Coast. Other instances might be cited of the indirect effects of control over patents and essential raw materials and of price control mechanisms, such as the basing-point system, that restrict interregional competition and the fullest economical development of each region. In general, monopolistic situations among individual industries have not been consciously directed by such industries against regions but have been aimed at competition regardless of its location. The incidental effects have been against the interests of certain regions primarily because of the concentration of industry in the Northeastern United States. The efforts of industries in the Northeast to protect themselves through monopolistic practices have probably resulted in some net protection to that region merely because most of our manufactures are located there. Along with this situation, we might also add the more conscious sectionalism that seeks to promote one region regardless of fundamental economic considerations and the total interest

of the nation. The opposition of the Northeastern states to the Southern governors in the rate case already referred to, and the relatively greater opposition to the Fair Labor Standards Act from Southern congressmen than from Northern congressmen are symptoms of regional monopolistic influences whereby one region seeks to maintain or gain an advantage over another region without regard to national interest. Obviously, if we are to adhere to the sound theory that the most economical development of our natural resources and the most economical location of our industries lead to the greatest national income and welfare, then we must advocate the withdrawal of regional restrictions whether they originate through monopolistic practices in industries or through political sectionalism.

Position of the northwest: On this national scene of interregional movements of industrial growth, the Pacific Northwest has only begun to make its debut. As I previously indicated, the index of manufacturing development (exclusive of wood products) relative to the national average was only 36 per cent in 1937. The Northwest, like the South, has been a colonial empire of the East and Middle West. While the South concentrated on the raw materials of cotton and tobacco, the Northwest specialized in cutting down its forests and making products of wood for the nation, and in shipping its minerals to the East. Most of the manufactured goods it consumes have come from other regions.

Just as continued mining of the soil without changes in farming practices and without a development of its mineral and industrial potentialities would only extend the impoverishment of the South, so a continuance of trends in the Northwest would only create in a generation another declining region. In the Northwest, man, fire, and disease are still destroying commercial timber faster than it grows. Without a change in forestry practices or the introduction of new employment possibilities, within thirty years the source of income of about 30 per cent of the population of 3,500,000 would largely vanish.

That is why the current and prospective developments of the Columbia River are of extreme importance. First, the irrigation project of the Bureau of Reclamation at Grand Coulee will, over a period of 10 to 20 years, provide 1,200,000 additional acres of farm land. This is 60 per cent of the estimated additional land that could be reclaimed in the Northwest through irrigation, drainage, and clearing, after allowance for the retirement of submarginal land. Grand Coulee will thus provide for about 20,000 additional farms directly supporting about 100,000 persons and indirectly stimulating service industries to support another 100,000.

Such an increase in the population of the region would facilitate the production of some of the manufactured goods now imported from the rest of the country. But a more immediate stimulus to industrial growth should arise from the power projects on the Columbia River. Bonneville and Grand Coulee will, if generating installations proceed as planned, add in ten years about 2,400,000 kilowatts of generating capacity to the North-

west, an amount 170 per cent greater than the existing capacity in Oregon and Washington. If, as is reasonable, all this power is made available at or near the present rates of the Bonneville Power Administration, nowhere else in the nation will there be a comparable supply of low-cost power. But looking still further ahead, the Bonneville and Grand Coulee power projects will make available only 19 per cent of the potential power inherent in the Columbia River and its tributaries. Translated into kilowatt hours, the potential annual output of the Columbia River Basin is 90 billion kilowatt hours, an amount equal to the output of the entire electric utility industry of the United States in 1929.

The industrial effects of power development in the Northwest will necessarily be specialized at first, attracting mainly those industries that require large amounts of power—the electrochemical and electrometallurgical industries. Among these are aluminum, electrolytic zinc, magnesium, ferrochrome, and calcium carbide. The establishment of such industries, one of which—aluminum—has already been started, should be followed by auxiliary industries, some supplying materials needed by these industries, others taking their products and processing them. But we should recognize that this anticipated development would provide only a moderate increase in employment and does not assure the type of large-scale industrial growth more likely in the South.

We should also recognize that the Northwest is greatly handicapped by the absence of any regional coordinating agency with the powers to promote needed research into markets and industrial processes using Northwest power and raw materials. It is not enough for the nation to build dams at Bonneville and Grand Coulee and make power available. The uses to which that power can be put in the best interests of the region and the country should be studied and promoted in the light of the resources available to the Northwest and the effects upon other regions.

The economics of national defense: Having reviewed the major regional industrial trends and influences affecting them, we are now able to appraise our position as we shift from a peace economy to a national defense economy. We are making this change with no well-defined concept of what kind of industrial development in peace time should be best advocated for each region and through what agencies it should be promoted. There is no organization investigating such problems nor are there any with executive authority to influence regional trends in a way that recognizes not only what is desirable for some regions but what repercussions would occur in other regions. On a regional level, the Tennessee Valley Authority alone is operating effectively for the benefit of certain Southern states. On the state level, various states have turned to an examination of their industrial possibilities and toward industrial promotion, but the states cannot take an adequate view of what is economically sound for the interests of the regions to which they belong and the nation as a whole.

Competition between states and communities for industries through tax concessions and special inducements and through the erection of trade barriers has, from the national view, undoubtedly included some wasteful effort. Barriers or inducements not resulting in the most economical locations²⁰ have represented a national loss in excessive costs of production, whether ultimately borne by consumers, by industry, or by the affected communities. Barriers and inducements happily leading to economical locations would have been unnecessary if industrial promotion were confined only to providing facts and minor services.

With respect to unwarranted interregional differences in freight rates and their effects upon regional industrial development, we are now becoming aware of the problem, and the Interstate Commerce Commission is investigating it from this new viewpoint.

Were it possible for these various movements to continue in the open light of a peace economy, it is probable that we would move from recognizing the necessity for national and regional planning of natural resources to recognizing the concomitant need for national and regional guidance of industrial development. The waste involved in present conflicts between regions and states would lead to recognition that we need a set of standards and an authority to guide industrial development within each region, subject to a national set of standards and an authority that takes into account the interrelations and repercussions upon other regions of industrial trends in any one region, and the net gain or loss to the nation. Great Britain, our predecessor in many social and economic advances, has just come to the point of recognizing its problems in the recent report of the Royal Commission on the Distribution of the Industrial Population.

Now, however, we are confronted with the likelihood that in the urgency of transition to a war economy, such problems must largely be ignored. It is obvious that our national defense must be established speedily and effectively and with regard to the assumed exposure of factories to military attack. Such considerations necessarily involve economic waste in a more expensive way of doing things. And the establishment and expansion of industries under defense considerations will affect the ultimate peace economics of the nation since the selection of locations today would make it wasteful later to expand in locations originally the most economical.

Of course, every region has existing and potential industries consistent with the urgencies of national defense. In the Northwest, our existing industries include shipbuilding, aircraft and engine manufactures, electrolytic zinc, lead and cadmium, and copper. These may expand harmoniously with our present regional advantages. Of greater concern to each region are its potentialities. Among Northwest potential industries, there is a group of materials strategic to national defense regarding which the

²⁰ Carle C. Zimmerman, *Industrial Migration From the Standpoint of Sociology*, Proceedings of the National Conference on Planning, May 15-17, 1939, p. 47.

Bonneville Power Administration has received inquiries or evidence of concrete interest. These include ferrochrome, aluminum and magnesium, calcium carbide and derivatives, elemental phosphorus and derivatives, chlorates and allied products, and tin based on Bolivian and possibly Alaskan ores. Most of these products require large amounts of electric power. Obviously, such potentialities and those of other regions cannot expect now to receive the deliberate consideration possible in time of peace. Yet, we can expect some of them to materialize out of the momentum of promotion already under way.

Finally, there is a group of industries feasible for the Northwest in the event national policy decides that the West should have certain defense industries to supply and protect its own area as well as to supplement production in the rest of the nation. These include high purity iron, steel and alloys for ordnance; brass for munitions; war gases and chemicals for explosives, including atmospherically fixed nitrogen. All of these products can be made from resources in or accessible to the Northwest, and most of them require large amounts of power.

With respect to the present federal power projects in the Northwest, it is obviously in the interests of national defense that they be linked under

TABLE I

INDICES OF REGIONAL INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Ratio of Manufacturing Wage Earners Per 1,000 Population in Various Regions to the United States Average for Specified Years, 1899-1937.

<i>Region</i>	1899	1909	1919	1929	1935	1937
United States.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
New England.....	245.7	233.7	212.9	187.1	185.3	176.7
Middle Atlantic....	167.5	158.9	150.2	135.6	134.1	130.9
East North Central..	108.3	115.3	130.0	139.8	142.9	148.9
West North Central..	41.5	44.7	45.9	49.6	46.0	45.7
South Atlantic.....	70.8	75.6	67.9	80.3	90.3	87.1
East South Central..	37.9	43.3	43.0	53.2	52.4	53.3
West South Central..	28.0	32.4	32.3	34.0	30.4	32.4
Mountain.....	42.9	39.8	37.0	38.5	31.8	34.1
Pacific.....	82.2	70.7	89.6	78.6	76.1	80.4
Eleven Western States.....	66.1	58.8	69.9	66.1	62.7	66.5
Pacific Northwest*	70.1	68.9	92.1	92.0	80.1	86.0
California.....	83.9	67.4	81.1	69.3	71.0	74.5

*Idaho, Washington, and Oregon.

Source: Based on the Census of Manufactures; the decennial census of population, 1900-1930; and mid-year population estimates of the Bureau of the Census for 1935 and 1937.

Bonneville Power Administration, Market Development Section, Economic Unit, June 7, 1940

one authority in a regional system mutually to support each other. The planned installations of additional generating units at the federal projects should be expedited in order to provide for expanding power demands, particularly some that may become necessary in the event of power shortages to meet needs in other parts of the country.

Looking now at the nation as a whole, it is evident that while thoughts of planning for a peace economy are receding into the background, machinery for the national planning of a war economy is being erected. This machinery at present is concentrated in Washington. But officials in Washington cannot know all of the potential contributions that each region can make and the relative costs of each, and congressional representatives are not equipped to be ambassadors for regional economies. There would accordingly appear to be a place for regional defense boards concerned with the contributions to national defense that each region can make and with presenting appraisals and recommendations to the defense authorities in Washington. From the operations of such boards we might learn about the problems of regional industrial guidance and profit in the future when we hope we can face the peace-time issues of regional industrial trends.

TABLE II

INDICES OF REGIONAL INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Ratio of Value Added by Manufacture Per Capita in Various Regions to the United States Average for Specified Years, 1899-1937.

<i>Region</i>	1899	1909	1919	1929	1935	1937
United States.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
New England.....	212.8	196.4	184.8	153.5	152.1	146.9
Middle Atlantic....	179.5	166.5	160.2	149.3	144.9	141.9
East North Central..	118.6	128.6	140.2	152.5	159.1	164.1
West North Central..	49.5	52.1	47.0	54.4	52.5	49.2
South Atlantic.....	47.6	52.3	56.0	60.2	62.5	62.9
East South Central..	31.0	37.7	31.5	36.2	38.0	37.8
West South Central..	23.9	29.9	30.0	30.2	29.8	31.9
Mountain.....	71.6	55.4	38.6	38.7	35.7	39.7
Pacific.....	91.7	90.0	96.6	85.9	87.5	88.4
Eleven Western States.....	83.5	76.6	74.9	71.2	71.8	73.8
Pacific Northwest*	71.8	79.5	91.8	80.7	74.2	80.6
California.....	98.0	92.8	92.5	84.9	90.2	88.7

*Idaho, Washington, Oregon.

Source: Based on the Census of Manufactures; the decennial census of population, 1900-1930; and mid-year population estimates of the Bureau of the Census for 1935 and 1937.

Bonneville Power Administration, Market Development Section, Economic Unit, June 7, 1940

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

REPORTER: Kenneth Sampson, *Land Use Engineer, Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission.*

DISCUSSION LEADERS: E. J. Coil, *Director, National Economic and Social Planning Association.*

Herbert S. Swan, *Municipal Consultant, New York City.*

Mr. Coil in opening the discussion of Mr. Raver's paper said: "The subject which Mr. Raver has considered will become one of the foremost subjects which planners will have occasion to consider in future meetings." The principal thesis of the paper, according to Mr. Coil, is that of industrial location and industrial development. He added, "In this regard we cannot permit ourselves to follow the past haphazard policies, but must provide some system whereby design and foresight can be utilized in guiding our industrial development. This question of policy did not arise as long as people were fundamentally tied to the soil. It has been with the growth of electric power, with the development of transportation facilities, and with mass consumption demands that this problem has come to the fore."

Mr. Coil went on to point out that there are other factors which also deserve consideration. He listed these under seven headings:

"1. *Unemployment.* The solution to the problem of unemployment is to be found through industrial growth.

"2. *National defense.* Defense in an era when war is an industrial process.

"3. *Economic measures.* When we begin to think of industrial location at the present time, with the factors of national unemployment and national defense in our minds, it becomes clear, as Mr. Raver pointed out, that we have new cost accounting standards to take into account. We must give consideration to the cost of substitute materials. Should we put millions into plants to make substitute rubber? We must compare the cost of substitute rubber with the cost of importing rubber from the Dutch East Indies, let us say, including the cost of upkeep of a navy, and all the other factors involved.

"4. *Surplus population.* Apparently the only solution for the surplus population, particularly of the southern area of the United States, is industrial employment. Does this mean we must follow a policy of bringing people out of the South and into industries in the North and the West or of taking industries into the South? There has been little research on the cost of maintaining a huge migration, running into millions of people, in the light of industrial employment, city planning, etc.

"5. *Costs.* We are going to have to consider what we have termed costs—revalue them, and attempt to take a larger view than we have in the past.

"6. *Size of industry.* Also as we raise the question of industrial location we cannot think exclusively in terms of big industries. Some of the most promising development in the United States in recent years has been in terms of so-called light industries, relatively small when compared with steel plants, for instance; and it is these light industries that are particularly in need of advice. The large plant can afford the necessary research staff to make investigations, but the small enterprise frequently cannot afford the necessary research facilities for deciding on the best location.

"7. *Advisory agency.* We should give consideration and advisory service not only to the large but to the small enterprise. I endorse Mr. Raver's proposal that there should be an advisory agency of the government concerned with analysis of the problems of industrial location. If such an agency is established, it will have a tremendous problem in gearing its activities with the democratic process."

Mr. Coil, with reference to this last point, added that if such an agency did come into being "it must take the initiative in giving guidance." He offered three reasons for this. In the first place, by taking a strong stand in attempting to give guidance "such an agency will perhaps relieve itself of most of the difficulty of pressures and be able to resist them"; secondly, if the industrial plant of the country does expand as employment opportunities increase, there may not be quite the frantic wooing of industry that there is at the present time when each community feels the burden of unemployment; and, lastly, in areas where the industry is already past its peak it will require strong stimulus on the part of the government itself to bring new industries into industrial areas and to revitalize the economic life of those communities.

Mr. Swan's paper, read in his absence, noted the alternate admiration and panic which the industrialists of the North had manifested toward "the phenomenal development which has occurred in the South during the past thirty years." He pointed out that the migration of northern industry to the South seemed to be gaining in volume. Mr. Swan then went on to discuss the various factors in this trend.

"Lower wages in the South," said Mr. Swan, "instead of being a temporary and passing phase in the earlier stages of its industrial development, are likely to remain permanently at a lower level than those in the North . . . each new expansion in industry brings about a new influx of farm hands into cities with the result that a steadier equilibrium is maintained between the number of jobs and the number of workers. The consequence is both a steadier and lower wage level."

Mr. Swan predicted that as the South becomes increasingly more industrialized, the competition between southern and northern industry is also apt to become more keen because the southern plants will have to compete not only against northern plants but among themselves, with the result that the lower labor costs in the South, costs which are now partially hidden because of lack of competition and consequent higher profits, will

be fully reflected in a still lower southern price. The result of this will be, in Mr. Swan's opinion, that "unless the northern mills are in a position, because of various other counterbalancing advantages, to absorb the entire difference in labor costs, they are forced to surrender the market to their southern competitors."

Another factor which would be likely to contribute to the further development in southern industry, in Mr. Swan's opinion, is the steady rise in transportation costs: "Increase in freight rates have the effect of decentralizing those industries in which transportation charges play an important role in fixing the delivered price of the product to the customer." Added to the rise in the freight costs and its decentralizing effects is the tendency to eliminate the freight-rate differentials between the North and the South. This equalization, said Mr. Swan, "would no doubt result in a considerable dislocation of the present distribution of certain industries . . . to the advantage of the South."

One advantage which the North has had over the South in the past, according to Mr. Swan, has been the more frequent use of the water transportation routes, and the consequent decrease in freight costs.

Mr. Swan declared that the increasing use of machines in contrast to skilled labor "though beneficial to all sections of the country may perhaps be expected to provide relatively more new employment to the South than to the North." He said that "industrial communities built upon skilled labor in the North err in assuming that skilled labor alone is sufficient to anchor industry permanently to a locality." Evidence to bear out this contention was cited. He also noted that the South was developing a supply of skilled labor of its own.

Mr. Swan predicted that the wage differentials between the North and the South will not be altered by the Wages and Hours Law. He said that "too much importance has been attached to the Wages and Hours Law as a means of stabilizing the location of industry. . . . Contrary to the general impression, increases resulting from the passage of the Wages and Hours Law were by no means confined to the South."

A factor of increasing importance is the location of the industry. Mr. Swan asserted that when we were a deficit manufacturing country, location was relatively unimportant, "but now that we manufacture more goods than we consume, and there is intense competition among plants for their respective shares in the domestic market, location is all-important to every plant." Recognition of this fact, Mr. Swan declared, has in recent years brought about a considerable migration of industry to new locations, and "insofar as these shifts result in either increased productivity or lower unit costs, they are to be both welcomed and encouraged as they place our political economy upon a more solid and profitable base." Mr. Swan felt, however, that much of the migration to the South "is to be explained more by the industrial cobwebs and debris which have through social neglect

been allowed to accumulate in the old community than by the superior profit opportunities latent in the new site."

Mr. Swan emphasized that "from the point of view of physical development and planning, the cities of the South have successfully avoided many of the errors committed by northern cities . . . but when it comes to a conscious planning and building of industrial foundations upon which the whole super-structure of the community rests, cities in the old South have learned very little from the mistakes of their sister cities in the North." A bad policy for any city is overspecialization of industry. "A natural consequence of this situation is a rather primitive sort of urban life."

Mr. Swan concluded with a discussion of the proper spheres for southern and northern industry. "The social and economic changes occurring in the South will require numerous adjustments in the industries of the North. . . . Each locality, whether in the North or the South should, after appraising its economic resources and potential capacity for competitive manufacture and distribution of goods, seek its own appropriate sphere in the industrial structure of the country. . . . The city which plans what it is going to do when it can no longer do what it is doing now—and does it in ample season—will be the successful and prosperous community of tomorrow whether it is situated in the North or in the South."

Mr. P. Hetherton remarked that a little over a year ago *Fortune Magazine* editorially regretted the lack of dynamic investments on the part of the government. The article contended that the government is spending its money in boondoggling and that no such investments were being made as developed the automobile industry or the building of roads or railroads. Mr. Hetherton pointed out that at the same time federal money was being paid out in the development of projects such as the Bonneville dam and the Tennessee Valley. "To my way of thinking," he declared, "these are the most dynamic investments that could be made."

In speaking of the Northwest Mr. Hetherton said that our economic life has in the past depended very largely on our forests. Something like sixty per cent of the Northwest payroll depends on its forests, although nothing very definite is being done about them. The present users are thinking of them as a supply of saw-logs rather than as a supply of cellulose. "What is needed there now," Mr. Hetherton concluded, "is an energetic, centralized authority."

Mr. Roy Bessey said that he would like to add to Mr. Raver's discussion of the Columbia Basin project. He noted that on the land side the 1,200,000 acres to be brought in should be compared to the 16,000,000 acres already in cultivation in the Pacific Northwest, to nearly 300,000,000 in the United States, to 30,000,000 which should be retired as submarginal, and to a like amount required for new population in a generation. "We

should also consider," he asserted, "that the middle third in America spends half as much again for food as the lower third—indicating that our consumption could and should be materially increased." Mr. Bessey stated that "On the power side the Grand Coulee capacity will about double, in say twenty years, the power capacity that will obtain in the region after completion of Bonneville. Power use has in the past doubled every ten years or less."

Finally, Mr. Bessey emphasized two very important suggestions made in this discussion: (1) the suggestion for some decentralization in planning for location of defense industries; and (2) the suggestion for research, experimentation, and pilot plant work in power use and industrial development in the West.

What Is Happening to Our Central Business Districts?

JOHN R. FUGARD

*The American Institute of Architects and
The National Association of Building Owners and Managers*

It is not without considerable hesitation that I have undertaken a discussion of subjects so vital to metropolitan and urban America.

All thinking people recognize that something is happening to central business districts; perhaps they are just now aware of those happenings, but few are cognizant of the causes and effects, and fewer people can foresee the predictable future.

Shifts of population, gradual and somewhat insignificant numerically at the inception, yet gaining momentum over the past two decades, have caused great areas of our cities to become almost depopulated, most evident in those areas surrounding central business districts, and demonstrated by the establishment of decentralized business communities.

This process of decentralization has been in progress for over twenty years, and population shift, as a part of this process, is due in large part to the automobile, improved bus lines, faster suburban rail transportation, and the breakdown of tax assessing and collecting agencies of local government. The process has been accelerated by rapidly mounting urban taxes, taxpayers' strikes, and the failure of public servants to perform their duties. It is a known fact that the cost of municipal, and other governments as well, never grows less, and this cost must be met by the taxpayer who actually pays taxes. The entire burden falls on his shoulders, not only in carrying his share of the burden, but also the share of those who do not pay property taxes. When an owner is unable or unwilling to pay taxes in return for municipal services, his property is allowed to deteriorate, and the start of a blighted area is under way.

The refusal of financial institutions to look beyond the present and to lend aid in stopping or overcoming blight has further hastened this process of decentralization. One wonders to what extent cities must be depopulated and property values shrink and disappear before the money-lender takes a realistic view of the situation and interests himself in the solution of the problem; and we speculate upon the extent of damage to our cities which must be manifest before our local statesmen think in terms of service to the people rather than in terms of service to their parties.

While central business districts connote office buildings, hotels, banks,

municipal government headquarters, and commercial institutions, all of which suffer through the process of decentralization, perhaps the chief sufferer is the office building. Yet an analysis of individual structures will prove that those intelligently conceived, properly planned, sensibly financed, and well managed, have come through the last decade with a fair record of occupancy, and with some measure of earnings for investors, which should increase as time goes on.

However, many of our outstanding office building structures built in the "golden twenties" were doomed at the start to failure because of poor planning and over-financing through over-capitalization by the greedy money-lender.

While the decade of 1920 to 1930 showed a vast expansion in office space, the first three years of the thirties showed a vacancy record mounting from 11 per cent to 27 per cent. From that time until 1937 about half the vacancy was absorbed, and since that time fairly stable occupancy has maintained.

The rental survey of the National Association of Building Owners and Managers shows an approximate present occupancy of 83 per cent for office buildings in 106 representative cities.

In spite of mounting taxes which now take approximately 26 per cent of gross income from metropolitan office buildings (an increase of nearly 8 per cent over ten years ago), earnings are slowly increasing as a result of several factors: The elimination of useless and obsolete buildings to provide parking spaces, thus affording better light and air to the remaining buildings, and providing better transportation facilities for the private automobile; the growing interest of tax assessors in earning power rather than fictitious brick and mortar values as a basis for tax assessment; and a slowly increasing improvement in general business conditions.

A really intelligent planning of downtown parking areas can result in real aid to all central business structures, not only in appearance but also in accessibility and in convenience to those who inhabit our commercial structures.

There are basic and fundamental reasons for the survival of downtown business areas, as they encompass the largest and finest retail centers, the centers of finance and headquarters for corporations, and afford the best transportation through rail and improved highway traffic systems. It would then seem that for the future permanency of the downtown districts, it will be necessary to start building up their marginal areas for residential needs (through the removal of restrictive measures now controlling financing of construction projects), and to arouse the interest of private industry in improving these sections of our cities.

A re-appraisal of marginal areas for tax purposes will be a necessary prerequisite in conversion from terms of wishful commercial expansion on the part of owners to terms of realistic residential location establish-

ment. The planning of safe streets through these residential areas for the diversion of through and heavy traffic to established traffic arteries must go forward for the protection of the residents. The establishment of parks and recreational spaces go hand in hand with the complete re-zoning of marginal areas to give permanency for decent living.

The proposals for rehabilitation of marginal areas come not from the standpoint of humanitarian or utopian concepts, which provide decent habitation at public expense for the underprivileged, but rather from the standpoint of a fair return on capital investment to private industry, which will furnish those dwellings required because of an imminent population shift from rural and suburban to urban areas.

Many factors underlie this coming population shift. We learn from those who have made long study of people that within the last twenty years a very definite trend has developed.

In 1920 one-sixth of the population was over 50 years of age, while in 1940 one-fifth of that same population had passed the age of 50. The change results, in part, from efforts of medical science to check infectious diseases and constitutional ailments affecting heart and lungs. The figures show that a large percentage of our people have passed the age of reproduction and have entered the age of greater consumption and the period of diminishing return in amounts produced per capita.

As we find a rise in median age, we note that the number of children produced per family declines, and as the family size declines in proportion to a slightly increasing population, the number of family units increases. The demand for dwelling units increases accordingly, although the requirement for dwelling space per family lessens.

As median age advances there is a definite social trend towards security, as there is a readiness for the acceptance of the doctrine of social security for people in the advanced age brackets.

In support of this theory, we may quote from Howard Loeb in the August, 1936, *Common Sense*, ". . . America has been transformed from a society in which 75 per cent of the population were free enterprisers into a social body in which 80 per cent work for wages or salaries, in the pay, for most part, of corporations: 14 per cent consists of farmers striving to recover cost of production, and some 6 per cent only devote themselves to entrepreneurial activities."

In short, this means that populations are becoming more and more interested in security and are placing less and less future upon enterprise.

No matter how eloquently the politician may declaim, no matter how many wishful-thinking planks may be contained in party platforms, we are not returning to the good old days of yesteryear when private enterprise was the long sought goal of the young man.

We have seen that world-wide tendency of populations to give up political and sometimes religious liberty, and even civil rights, to attain for themselves some measure of economic security through employment

for wages or a salary. Perhaps technological development and progress in big business within the last twenty years has hastened this process, for certainly that progress has lessened the chances for success of small enterprise.

The result, however, of this definite social trend has been to throw the burden of required new capital upon the state. This is manifested in the rapidly growing public debt and the demand that a greater number of public services be supplied by the state. With a rapidly increasing public debt, due to social demands upon the state, we find that, regardless of its benevolent and solicitous attitude, the state's only source of money supply is taxation of one kind or another.

Statistics show that during the last ten years taxes have increased from 6 per cent to 20 per cent of the total cash income of our population, and, if the present trend continues, and recent developments in Washington would indicate that there is no immediate prospect for a cessation of spending, economists estimate that within the next ten years over half of our total cash income will be required for tax purposes.

What has all this rather profound thinking to do with our central business districts?

In my opinion, which is based upon a study of the many factors involved, it would seem that as taxes increase (along with an increasing demand for public services and more definite social security), as the median age rises, and as a smaller family size produces a demand for more housing units of compact and economical size, there will be an ever increasing shift of population back to urban areas where economy of living, cheapness and efficiency of transportation, and proximity to employment are basic factors.

Thus we may expect to see the dismal marginal areas of downtown districts again become producers of financial return through rehabilitation in form and function. If properly planned, they will be residential areas where gracious and genial living conditions will maintain.

Herein lies the challenge to planners, for it is only then that we may expect to see the permanency of downtown business areas established and the process of decentralization halted.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

REPORTER: William E. Alworth, *City Plan Engineer, Pasadena.*

DISCUSSION LEADERS: Frank O. Evans, *Supervisor of Educational Housing, Los Angeles City Board of Education.*

Harry D. Freeman, *City Planning Engineer, Portland.*

S. Herbert Hare, *Planning Consultant, Kansas City.*

Lawrence M. Orton, *Member, New York City Planning Commission.*

Mr. Evans, in supplementing Mr. Fugard's paper, discussed the results of his study of the decline of the central area of Los Angeles from the standpoint of school enrollment. The data presented were taken for the years between 1930 and 1940. During the decade preceding that there had been little change in enrollment in downtown schools. While the tendency toward decentralization had been present, the factors involved in the general increase of population seemed to have offset it.

Mr. Evans had taken for study an area containing, in 1930, twenty elementary schools, three junior high schools, and two senior high schools, almost all of them within a two-mile radius of the center of the downtown business section. During the following decade one of the junior high schools, seven of the elementary schools and one special school have been closed out—approximately one-third of the school facilities of the district. The reduction in number of schools, however, has exceeded the reduction in number of pupils: the enrollment in grades one to six in these twenty schools decreased 28.6 per cent. The average size of the remaining schools has therefore been increased.

The decrease in enrollment has not been continuous. The most striking exception occurred during 1936-1937 when immigration from the dust bowl increased the enrollment about one thousand two hundred in less than a year. This was but a temporary increase, however.

Mr. Evans pointed out interesting changes which have taken place in regard to race or language spoken in this section. The one racial group which has made actual as well as relative gains in the last decade is the Spanish speaking group: the actual gain being about 5 per cent of the original number. The decline in the English speaking group amounted to only about 18 per cent—probably because of the migration of English speaking people from the Middle West. Surprisingly enough, the number of children of Oriental parentage has declined about 42 per cent in the last decade. Another interesting feature is the breaking up of certain national centers.

Another serious problem is that of improving school housing facilities when faced with such general decline. In some cases buildings have been replaced with smaller ones or temporary buildings have been used.

Mr. Freeman stated that decentralization of central business districts was inevitable; that it was only a part of the general problem of decentralization which has gained so much headway in American cities in the past quarter of a century. The very nature of modern urban transportation, plus the desires of people, and of industry, will result in further spreading of urbanized areas. It was stated that this movement was simply a redistribution of people and of business and industry.

With shifting of population and land use, there are automatic changes in land value; that is, redistribution of assessed values automatically follows a redistribution, or decentralization, of land uses.

Mr. Freeman stated that in the decentralizing process the central business districts were shorn of those uses of property which did not belong downtown. Principally, there are two factors contributing to such losses in business activity: (1) much retail trade, and certain other activities, will follow buying power to outlying locations; (2) congestion and inconvenience to the individual have accelerated downtown disintegration.

This discussor emphasized that we should not approach the problem of the central business district "by trying to devise schemes to bolster, or subsidize, ground values, as such," but that we should picture the problem of the whole metropolitan area as one of providing service to the entire urban area with efficiency and convenience. This, of course, should be comprehended in the complete master plan. In short, we should have a logical pattern of land use.

Speaking again of tax losses, Mr. Freeman stated that losses downtown will be counter-balanced by gains in outlying centers because the total tax duplicate is built upon the city's population and its buying power.

Mr. Freeman cited the condition in Portland, Oregon, to typify what is happening to business districts. The entire history of that central business district was briefly sketched with the aid of maps.

In the early days, the city of Portland was on the west bank of the river and first changes in downtown business uses were to the west, away from the river, and in the direction of buying power. Once started, this westward movement of business continued, leaving in its wake a lesser use of property, obsolescence and great losses in assessed values.

In the meantime a substantial population had been accumulating east of the river and Portland experienced the peculiar situation where growth in the central business district was to the west while the center of population was moving to the east.

Today, a large area between the "high value" district and the west bank of the river presents a problem, yet it points to possibilities. The central business district probably will never grow again towards the west; and it cannot expand to the north or south because of barriers which were described. The only logical direction for any future growth is to the east, that is, back into the old obsolescent area left behind years ago.

Last May the "Front Avenue project" for the Portland waterfront was

approved in a referendum vote. This means that Portland will have a riverfront park or "front door" about three-fourths of a mile in length and a fine traffic distributor street through the waterfront parkway. The next problems in the Portland business district are (1) to determine logical uses for the large obsolescent area "between Fourth Avenue and the river" and (2) to develop adequate off-street parking facilities. The first problem requires a very thorough analysis of the types of uses which should be placed in the old waterfront district. The second problem requires much educational work and determination of a method of financing off-street parking facilities.

Mr. Hare, in his discussion of Mr. Fugard's paper, expressed the opinion that regardless of losses of tax revenue and investments due to decentralization, we will always have a central business district in our cities because of the greater selection of merchandise and because of the convenience of doing business in a section containing a large number of offices, banks, stores, etc. We must, however, squarely face the question of whether we are trying to maintain artificial values in the central business district, based on the promise of continued growth. If, however, the central district is being stifled by difficulties of individual or mass transportation, parking, etc., then it presents a problem to which the planner must give immediate consideration.

Mr. Hare suggested several ways in which proper planning can affect the central area: (1) by improving thoroughfares and mass transportation, with due regard for the safety of pedestrians; (2) by providing parking facilities and making them available through the cooperation of the merchants; (3) by improving the appearance of downtown buildings; (4) by encouraging the use of marginal land around the center for housing through rezoning, revision of the building code, provision for park and recreational facilities, and perhaps development of neighborhood units; and by adjustment of taxation on the basis of probable income from land rather than its speculative value.

Mr. Orton stated that the problem of decaying business centers in our cities is a general and serious one and that the forces causing this decay are no temporary or superficial phenomena but, rather, go to the very roots of our modern urban existence. We are just beginning to feel the far-reaching effects of the invention of the automobile, the drastic reduction in population growth and so forth.

"But it will not be enough," Mr. Orton said, "for businessmen or planners to deplore these trends. The central business district cannot be preserved if it does not deserve to survive on the basis of the hard facts of adequate and economical service. It is nothing less than the entire pattern of the city which must concern us if we are to think independently and act effectively in these matters."

Mr. Orton felt that New York had at least reached this point. It has been concluded there that nothing is to be gained by excessive diffusion of

New York City and that many of the older parts of the city can be successfully rehabilitated for residential purposes, thereby strengthening the inlying business and industrial areas.

That alone, however, will not preserve central business areas unless they are adapted to modern needs; unless they are convenient, accessible and economically placed for doing business. Mr. Orton feels that New York has taken tremendous strides in this connection with its construction of a comprehensive system of express highways. Parking still presents a serious problem but its solution should be expedited by the very fact of the highway improvements.

Mr. Herbert U. Nelson, Executive Vice-President of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, recommended the following methods of attack on the problem:

1. Relief of traffic congestion through the elimination of cruising taxicabs; a tax of perhaps \$5.00 per year on automobile owners who use the public streets for parking; and the use of shuttle buses from conveniently located parking lots to and through the central business district.

2. Improved architectural appearance through the removal of overhead signs, etc.

3. Planned business districts with segregation of amusement sections and other uses.

4. A building height limit of eight stories. (Congestion and blight go hand in hand, and Mr. Nelson was doubtful that rezoning alone would be of much help in the rebuilding of the downtown sections.)

5. Controlled subdivision. (Mr. Orton recommended that subdivisions be controlled and limited through the fixing of maximum and minimum standards of improvement and a guarantee from the subdivider for the construction of a certain number of houses within a specified period of time.)

6. The creation of departments of public works to take the place of existing city planning commissions. (Mr. Nelson felt that purely advisory bodies are futile.)

7. Reorganization of the United States Housing Authority, perhaps through the creation of limited-dividend corporations.

Highways and Planning

HARLEAN JAMES

Executive Secretary, American Planning and Civic Association

In the United States we built most of our mileage in highways without regard to the land uses of the public and private property along the traveled route. In New England the highways often followed the old Indian and pioneer trails. Even the great National Pike which was promoted early in the nineteenth century across the Alleghenies followed what was called Nemocolin's Indian Trail, broadened and used in the eighteenth century by Braddock as he marched to Fort Duquesne in the wilderness. Many stretches of the road to Pittsburgh yet follow this old trail. Over most of the three-million-odd square miles of the continental United States, as the land was surveyed, the plan was to lay out roads along the section lines providing a grid of mile-square spaces, cut into half- and quarter-miles as settlements became more dense.

As for improvements, about all that was expected was a little grading, a drainage ditch when necessary, and, across swampy land, a rough pavement of logs to make what was called the corduroy road—an all-weather road when it could be found under the snow or when logs had not rotted out or slipped to become danger traps for the unwary horses' feet. Except for all-too-occasional replacement of logs and levelings off when the ruts from the wagon wheels wore too deep for traction, the surface was kept packed down by the horses' hoofs and the iron-rimmed wagon wheels.

The roads were meant for local and through travel, the rate of speed being about the same, the edge, if anything, being in favor of the carriage or light equipage used for local transportation. Access to abutting property was taken for granted and probably the time was never envisioned when access might interfere with through or local transport. The principal use of land bordering rural highways was agriculture, but there were long stretches of untouched forest and open, grassy plains. The inns, blacksmith shops and general stores were mostly in the village settlements. These pioneer conditions persisted in the Middle West until the middle of the nineteenth century, in the Far West until well towards its close. We may think of them as so far in the past as to have little significance today, but when we consult our memories or the records we must recall that forty years ago few were familiar with that new and unbelievable contraption, the horseless carriage. Thirty years ago few of us owned them and not until the self-starter came into common use did many of us drive them. It was only twenty-four years ago that federal-aid on any substantial scale was voted by the Congress of the United States to stimulate and hasten

the improvement of a nation-wide system of highways, known as the farm-to-market roads. The end of this era came only last year, when the Bureau of Public Roads was transferred from the Department of Agriculture to the newly created Public Works Administration. These farm-to-market roads centered on state capitals and county seats.

I well remember my first transcontinental trip, seventeen years ago, when west of Saint Louis we found only short stretches of hard surface of any kind running out from the principal cities, and east of Saint Louis many miles of single-track brick pavement which made it necessary to run one wheel in the skiddy mud or deep ruts whenever two cars met. For all the fine designations given to the old trails, Lincoln or other highways, there was no continuous broad highway to link the east and the west coasts. A pioneer cross-country motorist picked a precarious way, without benefit of understandable direction signs, along an extraordinary number of casual unimproved roads and streets which were pieced together into a circuitous route across the continent. Most of the direction signs were large billboards where competing routes, ferries or towns were trying to lure the traveler, and there was no easy way to secure reliable information. There were tumble-down piers and small ferry boats which could be summoned, if the crew were not eating their dinners, even for the crossing of important rivers. There were long miles of deep sands which could only be negotiated with the help of sage brush and gunny sacks and sometimes, when all else failed, a tow car. There were other long miles of rocky roads not so famous as that to Dublin but disastrous to tires and springs. We are not yet entirely out of the era of the billboard bid for bridges, ferries and routings. No doubt these will disappear in the next decade and we can then depend on reliable official information as to distances and types of roadbeds.

With the advent of federal-aid, toll roads have gradually been retired, though toll bridges and ferries still exist, and the recent development of parkways which are designed for through, as well as local, travel has brought a revival of tolls.

In the twenty-four years during which we have been digging ourselves out of the mud, we have paved and repaved once or more, located and relocated many miles of through highways. We have not yet a single transcontinental highway running in any direction, which was deliberately located for the sole purpose of providing for through travel. Our much vaunted transcontinental routes are still made up of state, county and local highways and city streets, laid out by some arbitrary plan or to meet local needs. These are pieced together and designated by some number which runs from coast to coast. But even today on Route 40, which starts so bravely over the Alleghenies as a paved road, there are west of Denver many miles of gravel, bound and loose, with the always recurring work periods to interfere with travel.

It has not been many years since we first became acquainted with the

by-pass road to avoid the congestion of cities and towns. In many parts of the country it is still difficult to persuade the merchants that too great a congestion of through traffic actually militates against business and makes life more difficult for their actual patrons. Most of the larger cities are now provided with marked routings which circle the residence sections of the city, often marked so poorly that the long-suffering motorist loses the way several times before emerging on the main highway on the other side of town, after having traveled a substantial additional mileage in comparison with fighting through a direct route comprising the principal business streets of the city.

During these forty years in which motor travel—passenger and freight—has been developing and during these twenty-four years in which we have been digging ourselves out of the mud, we have built up the largest pleasure traffic of any nation in the world; indeed, we have more peacetime motor vehicles than any other country in the world. We have begun to see, somewhat tardily it is true, that there is a direct relationship between the use of the land along the highways and the highways themselves. When the National Pike was projected in the early part of the nineteenth century, we had in all the United States only a few million inhabitants. When automobiles came into common use, say about 1910, our population was 91,972,266. Since that time we have gained about 40,000,000 people and the occupied sections of the country have extended into remote highways and by-ways.

Planning in the modern sense was still in the city-beautiful stage during the first decade of the twentieth century. In the second decade, which introduced federal-aid highways, the problems of street congestion, promoted in part by high buildings, saw the initiation of zoning. Now at the completion of the third decade, when we have a population of some 132,000,000, we have come to the period of the articulation of the various techniques of road location and construction, planning and zoning, to give us the facilities which we need and some of the amenities which, with more leisure and growing discrimination, we are coming to demand.

While the public money spent during the past quarter of a century on construction and maintenance of highways may not be equal to the national debt, it still is a considerable sum, and the people of the United States collectively, through the expenditure of taxes, have acquired a financial interest in these investments which should confer some degree of control of travel conditions on one or more of their governmental agencies. The discovery of the gasoline tax and the automobile license and tax has provided funds beyond the dreams of Midas himself with which to build and maintain highways, but we have not yet made much progress in securing a fair return for our collective investment in highways. We are struggling to find ways in which the owners of abutting property, who have contributed little or nothing to the cost of through highways, may be prevented from confiscating some of the values which the users of highways,

who have contributed substantially to their cost, feel that they have in all equity purchased. We are coming to realize that the owners of land along arterial and heavily traveled highways do not necessarily have the right to exploit for private profit the facilities provided by great public expenditures.

In this fourth decade of the twentieth century, therefore, let us map out a few of the methods which are coming into vogue by which the people of the United States may secure their money's worth for the expenditures they are making in their public highways. I have sketched the historical development of highway planning and zoning in order that we may proceed to discuss next steps without praise or blame for the past. New conditions have overtaken us so recently and new techniques and governmental practices have developed so rapidly that we should absolve from blame those whose practices we wish to change. Highway transportation has grown in volume and extent faster than we have been able to develop governmental planning control.

We thought that this country was pretty well supplied with rural roads back in 1900. When hard surfacing of various sorts became common, it was generally laid down on existing roads. When the clutter of roadside structures, gasoline pumps and signs and billboards sprang into existence without rhyme, reason or regulation, we naturally addressed ourselves, however feebly, to the problem of the roadsides. Most of the highways carried telegraph and telephone lines. Many of the pioneers had planted roadside trees as a labor of love, and many highways traversed forested regions. But the butcheries of the telephone and telegraph linemen have left tortured and misshapen roadside trees through the length and breadth of our fair land.

Since we had inherited certain public roadside strips of land we thought of our problem in terms of roadsides. First we undertook to clean up the public rights-of-way. In most states no private structure, encroachment or billboard is now permitted within the public right-of-way. But we accepted the location and design of our highways as fairly static. The changes of the last twenty years have taught us better. We know that during the next quarter of a century there will be new highways and re-located old highways on a scale never before dreamed of. So that our problem is not only confined to roadsides, but it must deal fundamentally with the location, design and treatment of highways of various sorts, and the highway must be integrated with the use of the abutting public and private land. In other words, we have it in our power to do constructive and preventive planning as well as to apply the far more costly make-shift remedial measures.

Already many highway departments have on their staffs trained landscape designers in addition to road engineers, but not always are the landscape designers permitted a voice in the layout and treatment of the highway as a whole. Too often they are permitted to exercise their arts

on the all-too-inadequate strip which has been left after the destruction of construction has done its worst!

But it is in the uses of private property along the highway that we have suffered most. Hard surfacing of existing highways or construction of new highways has made every owner of property along the way feel that he has an inherent right to erect buildings and billboards and to conduct roadside business without direction or control. Thus we have thousands of miles of highways used, especially near cities and towns, by four and six lanes of congested traffic, into which there is access from abutting land and from commercial uses at such frequent intervals as to create an acute safety hazard.

What can we do about the admittedly deplorable conditions which exist in and along many of our highways today? What remedies, already put into effect in some places, can we extend for the benefit of the public? What further remedies can we propose?

Our problem concerns new highways and existing highways, planned and zoned districts, and unplanned and unzoned districts.

For new highways it would seem that we might have a free hand to bring about the results we desire. First we have the decisions concerning origin and destination, whether the highway be a federal-aid road or a county or other local road. Then we must know whether it is to be used by mixed traffic or whether it is to be dedicated to pleasure travel. If it be mixed traffic we must know whether the volume will justify immediately or in the future two, four or six lanes. We must know the type of country to be traversed. Beyond the local needs of the communities to be touched, we must know, approximately, the needs of the highway users in the way of roadside facilities. Only then are we in a position to decide the width of rights-of-way, the routing of the highway, and the protections which must be secured and maintained. In securing rights-of-way, a great deal can be done in securing easements from the property owners selling the rights-of-way, and some of the protected highways, such as the approach road to Norris connecting with the Knoxville road, have been secured in this manner. If the highway runs through county-planned and -zoned territory, the use of private property abutting on it may be controlled, and commercial uses may be limited to the recognized needs. The freeway principle by which rights-of-way are secured in the states which have adopted a freeway law makes it possible, where desirable, to secure rights-of-way without conferring any right of access for abutting property. But so far this principle has been limited to actual physical road access. It has not been extended to include access to the sight of highway users. It would seem to a layman that a freeway might be protected from both sorts of access.

Up to the present time, the parkway has been the most successful type of new highway in the matter of very nearly absolute protection; for, with wide rights-of-way, roadside planting can screen any glimpse of un-

desirable developments on abutting property or open pleasing vistas. At first, most of these parkways were built by counties in districts where dense occupation and high property values made it possible to finance and maintain such luxuries. But the parkways of Westchester County, New York, have become so popular that they have been extended as toll roads into other parts of New England as a part of the provision for caring for through traffic, and the new Merritt Parkway, connecting with the Saw Mill and Henry Hudson Parkways in New York, is now furnishing through connections from New England to points south of New York City with great success. Where parkways are a part of the circulatory system, there seems to be no good reason why they should not profit by sharing in the gasoline tax receipts. This proposal is not new and is in actual effect in some localities. It is not a diversion of gasoline tax money to public expenditures unrelated to facilities especially used by motorists. Undoubtedly parkways will be extended to many thousands of miles in the next few years. States will build parkways to connect their state parks and other scenic attractions. The federal government has already embarked on a parkway program. The Skyline Drive in Shenandoah National Park has been extended south as the Blue Ridge Parkway leading to the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. This, with the Natchez Trace National Parkway, will bring into use more than a thousand miles of federal parkways in the East. Who can suppose that the idea will not spread to other parts of the country, as the protected beauty of these parkways is recognized? Already visitors to the several hundred completed miles of this scenic parkway along the Appalachians have outnumbered visitors to any other national park and the enthusiastic comments of western as well as eastern motorists are an indication of the demands of the future. These parkways will usually be freeways, in so far as the control of access is concerned. They usually traverse scenic areas in which protection is more important than new planting. But they are little concerned with the control of private property along the way, because the land to be seen from the driveway is usually in public ownership or can be planted out of sight of users of the parkway.

But we have already in the United States 3,000,000 miles of rural roads. Except for the parkways, the so-called federal highways are really federal-aid state roads. On these existing highways, there are those who believe that ultimately we can control the uses of private property abutting on them through county planning and zoning. Ten years ago, the then American Civic Association called a conference of representatives of other organizations and public officials to discuss with its own members methods of what we then called roadside control. Some of us thought that the state which pooled such extensive tax moneys with the federal-aid moneys should have something to say about the use of private property along its improved highways. We proposed to give the state some authority to control the use of such private property. But our friends, the planners,

said, "No, that is strip zoning and so is iniquitous. Nothing short of comprehensive zoning of a complete district is sound. Let us work for county zoning and this will be our answer." Well, we worked and waited ten years. During that time some thirty counties have been zoned more or less comprehensively. We are glad that this has been accomplished. But when we contemplate that there are three-thousand-odd counties in the United States, all of them furnished with some sorts of roads, and many of them traversed by important state and national highways, it is a little discouraging to estimate that at the present rate of progress it would take a thousand years to complete the zoning of the counties of the United States. Even if the rate of progress were to be considerably accelerated there seems little prospect that we can depend exclusively on county planning and zoning to control in the interests of the public and the highway users (almost synonymous terms) the private property along public highways. Out of this discouraging situation has arisen a fairly widespread and insistent demand for some sort of state action to bring into line the control of the uses of abutting private property which directly affect the use of the highway.

Mr. Alfred Bettman has drawn up an elaborate proposed measure which not only establishes a method of control, but sets up in the state act itself the principles and objectives which are often incorporated into regulations under an enabling act. Generally speaking, the enactment of such a law would seem to be too good to be true. Whether legislatures can be induced to pass a ten- or fifteen-page act dealing in so much detail with the establishment of public authority over private property in unaccustomed ways may be doubted. On one matter, Mr. Bettman's proposed act would actually be retrogression. He includes a paragraph, no doubt aimed at lessening opposition, stating that "outdoor advertising shall not be excluded from business or industrial districts, provided, however, that the (Highway) Commission may regulate the sizes and locations of such advertising within such districts." At the present time, while billboards are permitted in most city commercial and industrial districts, they are excluded from decentralized commercial districts in the Montgomery County, Maryland, area under the jurisdiction of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, the enabling legislation for which was drawn by Mr. Bettman. This precedent seems to many of us one that might well be followed in the setting up of small commercial areas along rural highways. These could with propriety be restricted commercial areas, with specified types of business permitted or excluded. The situation may be somewhat different in the approach highways to cities, but undoubtedly the time will come when cities and counties will cooperate to give to the metropolitan area approach roads of which the community may be proud. When that day comes, can anyone doubt that billboards will be banned, signs restricted in number and size? Already there is con-

siderable competition among oil companies to provide attractive filling stations. This may lead to a wider observance of the amenities on the part of all commercial institutions bidding for business along the rural highways.

The act proposed by Mr. Bettman has the same objective, and in the main the same procedures, as those proposed by the American Planning and Civic Association. To some degree this is true of the measure recommended by the Committee on Roadside Development and Control of the American Automobile Association. In all three, the state highway commission would be charged with the authority for zoning or designating the uses to which private property abutting on public highways may be put. The Civic Association's proposed measure was in agreement with Mr. Bettman's suggested act in requiring that the highway commission act after consultation with the state planning board, if any. The proposed bills of both the Civic Association and the Automobile Association were efforts to simplify the enabling act in the interest of securing its passage. They provide for setting up protective areas on each side of the highway and for designating commercial areas. In the final form both took account of existing built-up areas, but left it to the discretion of the highway commission, with the advice of the planning board, to continue or not to continue these areas as commercial districts. Both recognized the desirability for comprehensive county zoning and the right of the county and the city to make greater restrictions than those in effect by the state.

There has been some discussion as to whether the state highway commission should be placed in charge of zoning or controlling the uses of private property only along the state highways or whether this authority should extend to all highways outside of incorporated cities and towns throughout the state. The reason for limiting the authority to the land along state highways was that here obviously the state was expending funds and conferring benefits for which in equitable return certain compensating restrictions might be set up. The justification for extending the authority to all rural roads is that county roads need the protection as much as state roads and the motorist is hardly conscious when passing from one to the other. A further legal justification may be found in the fact that the state does actually contribute funds to many county highways.

There are those who believe that the control of strips along the highways by the state should not be called zoning. This is a legal question not easily settled by laymen. Whether called zoning or control through the police power, an increasing number of citizens is demanding that the state step in to protect its expenditures in highways and give to highway users a greater degree of safety, comfort and pleasure.

Many existing highways were at first in use for a comparatively limited volume of traffic. As through traffic increased and residence neighborhoods extended into the rural country outside of cities, highway widening

has been needed. At first this took the form of added lanes of pavement, sometimes separated in the middle, sometimes not. More recently, where the access problem has become aggravated, service streets, entirely separated from the through travel lanes, have been built to provide property access. Usually this required securing a wider right-of-way and the plan could be used only when the land was comparatively open or the setbacks sufficient to permit the building of the service roads.

This principle has been used to advantage in the building of new highways. When freeways or parkways are built, it can be applied, or, as frequently occurs in Westchester County, the service road is entirely unconnected with the parkway which borders the rear of residential property facing on another street.

In summary we may list the items of legislation and administrative practice by which a state may measure its progress toward provision of facilities and amenities which serve its population and attract some part of that great pleasure traffic the provision for which directly and indirectly is fast advancing to first place among the industries of America.

1. Adequate landscape advice on the staffs of state and county highway agencies, utilized from the inception of new highways, and applied in the treatment and maintenance of the rural highways.

2. Close cooperation between state and county highway agencies with state and county planning agencies to the end of articulating highway design with present and future land uses.

3. State legislation authorizing or requiring county planning and zoning, authorizing construction of freeways, authorizing use of gasoline tax for construction and maintenance of parkways which contribute to the motorway circulation system of the state; authorizing state highway commissions, with the advice and approval of state planning boards, to control the use of private property abutting on rural highways, in the interest of the safety, convenience and pleasure of highway users; directing license of billboard companies and taxation of billboards. (This in the interest of orderly procedure with the expectation that billboards will be reduced, but without hope that they can be eliminated from any considerable areas or confined to highly commercial districts.)

4. The exercise of county zoning which should give a comprehensive plan and zoning districting to the county on which all new highway plans could be based and which would dictate changes in location, treatment and use of existing highways to provide for articulated highway and land use.

5. The provision for state and county parkways, where appropriate, to be financed from gasoline tax supplemented, when a part of the state's highway system, by federal aid.

6. The extension of the freeway principle to appropriate new through highways and in modification of existing highways where through traffic

and local access interfere with each other and add to the hazards of the road.

7. The extension, as rapidly as possible, of comprehensive planning and zoning for counties by which commercial and industrial uses may be limited to public convenience and all other rural land along the highways protected from such uses. The application of some plan by which non-conforming uses in the county zoning plan may ultimately be brought to an end.

With all these methods put to full use, with federal parkways supplementing state activities and with an increased vigilance on the part of cities to provide adequate arterial entrances within their borders and to protect suburban residential and commercial areas from unsightly structures, the time may not be far distant when motorists may travel from one end of the United States to the other without being offended by the man-created ugliness which has replaced the native landscape and the pastoral beauty of farm homes and fields. Within city limits there is no reason why tree-lined parkways and boulevards should not continue the rural parkways and through highways directly into the business centers.

Many citizen organizations have carried on educational campaigns to bring about such a consummation. The American Civic Association, under the leadership of Dr. J. Horace McFarland, was a pioneer. The National Roadside Council, under the able leadership of Mr. and Mrs. W. L. Lawton and Mr. Albert Bard, has made a signal contribution to the cause, and through the cooperation of the American Nature Association has been enabled to reach a wide public. The Garden Club of America, the National Council of State Garden Clubs, the General Federation of Women's Clubs have all carried on active programs. In the last few years, the American Automobile Association has had a Committee on Roadside Development and Control which should enlist valuable cohorts to bring about suggested changes in legislation and practice in the states. Since 1935, due to a gift from Mrs. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., the American Planning and Civic Association has been enabled to work through its legal counsel, Flavel Shurtleff, in the drafting of suggested legislation and in close cooperation with groups in many states who are struggling to protect the remnant of our native scenery which remains intact and to protect highway travelers from the iniquitous ugliness and squalor which has followed closely on the public expenditure of funds for so-called highway improvement.

We commend the programs advocated by these lay organizations to the official planners, engineers and consultants, to the members of highway commissions and planning boards, to the state legislators and administrators, to the county supervisors and municipal authorities, for we believe with the public opinion generated by these organizations and citizens at large legislative and administrative officials may act with impunity to bring about practical improvements in highways and adjacent areas.

Architectural Control in America

CHARLES H. CHENEY

Secretary, Palos Verdes Architectural Board and Art Jury

Good architecture and attractive neighborhoods, gardens and landscaping are what make a city worth while. They comprise the most important amenities—the niceties or attractions of environment—that give life satisfaction. Everything else is secondary. The measure of them is largely the measure of a city.

How can we obtain these values? Architectural control is the only method so far discovered to ensure them in new buildings. To enforce architectural control competently requires establishment of an architectural board of review to pass on all plans of buildings, signs and other improvements at the time the usual building permit is applied for. Where a majority of this board are trained architects and they are given legal veto over the design, color and location of the structure on the property, they can obtain results of permanent value. For seventeen years I have served on such a board.

Is San Francisco still only 11 per cent of a city? Or has the percentage of good architecture and good environment increased here? Has it done anything constructive to better its situation; established architectural control over new buildings?

Should we now rate San Francisco 12 per cent, as we once did Los Angeles and New York, or only 8 per cent, like Chicago? Some of you will remember the interesting appraisals of the more important cities of the United States made in 1927, and presented in that year at a joint session of the old National Conference on City Planning and the American Institute of Architects. Those figures were widely published and discussed. Additional figures were presented the next year at the meeting in Dallas, Texas.¹

Will those of you who read or hear this paper look around when you go home and try to evaluate your cities? It is a sad commentary on our present civilization that in general 80 to 90 per cent of the buildings in American cities are ugly and badly designed. Many are also so repulsive in color and so lacking in any softening and refreshing grace of planting that even a considerable number of structures of good design among them cannot offset the distressing effect of the bad ones. The impression of the whole is dominated by the bad examples.

¹ "Progress in Architectural Control" and "Building for Permanency," published in the Proceedings of the National Conference on City Planning, Washington, D. C., 1927, and Dallas, Texas, 1928.

Deteriorated neighborhoods, blighted districts, cause an enormous economic loss.

Lack of architectural control is the greatest single cause of these conditions—greater even than obsolescence. In fact, it promotes obsolescence!

Worse still is the unhappy, stilted, ugly environmental condition produced for the unfortunate people who must live there. And they constitute more than four-fifths of us all! The condition is mentally unhealthful and economically and socially unsound for the nation.²

Signs and billboards are the commercialized vice of architecture, as pointed out in a recent article.³

Shall we permit large, off-color, "shouting" signs, or shall we try to hold to reasonably proportioned "directional" signs only, of a color harmonizing with the neighborhood? This subject has been touched on by Miss Harlean James. All honor to this veteran worker for civic betterment. In a lifetime of planning I know of no other lay person who has obtained so many real amenities for city, state or nation.

Have any experiments been made in actual architectural control? If so, where, and how have they worked out?

San Francisco itself offers one example—St. Francis Wood, undoubtedly one of the most perfect home neighborhoods of America. We rate it 95 per cent. Every visitor to this conference should see its 300 acres of development—one of the best this country has to offer in planning and architectural control. It is located west of Twin Peaks and designed and planted by Olmsted Brothers, landscape architects. Here was set up a comprehensive scheme of protective restrictions, requiring approval by an architectural committee of the local homes association of the plans of all buildings before construction. The excellent results are clear to see. The directors of the homes association would probably be glad to talk to you about it.

There are a number of other notable residential neighborhoods in the country where architectural control has been totally or partially exercised with good effect. The best known are the Roland Park-Homeland-Guildford section of Baltimore, Forest Hills Gardens on Long Island, the Country Club District in Kansas City, and several in the Los Angeles area—Palos Verdes Estates, Cerritos Park in Long Beach, Emerald Bay in Laguna, and the Rancho Santa Fe, a small area near San Diego. All of these have, I believe, the advantage of fully competent boards of review, a majority of whom in each case must be trained architects who can read plans and visualize the proposed building as it will look when erected on the site. They operate by virtue of protective deed restrictions, by mutual contract between all the property owners of their area. There

² "A Brief for Architectural Control" by H. B. Brainerd in the March-April, 1938, *Planner's Journal*, and "Aesthetics and Zoning" by T. W. Mackesey in the Oct.-Dec., 1939, number of the same magazine present valuable material on the subject.

³ "Architectural Control," published in the *Octagon*, Journal of the A. I. A., March, 1940.

are court decisions sustaining such powers where the restrictions have been properly drawn. The control is complete and effective.

Cities or counties seeking to inaugurate architectural control under the police power are in a different position, with more limited precedent. The beginning made at Santa Barbara in 1925, and the piecemeal work of planning commissions in San Diego, Sacramento and in the counties of Monterey, San Mateo, etc., in this state, and in New Orleans, Charleston, and a few other Eastern cities are a recognition of the problem. Yet at best they are only halfway measures.

Heretofore planners have been too occupied with trying to bring a little order out of our mussed-up cities to give serious attention to architecture. Buildings are the most conspicuous, the most intimate, continuously used and observed part of every city. Just as the trees in the forest make the forest, so the houses of a city make a city.

Architecture means, to the average person, all buildings—whether good, bad or indifferent. Some architects are still trying to argue that only structures of good design should be called architecture; and some of them still battle about the term “architectural control,” used by planners to designate the growing movement for the establishment of architectural boards of review. On the whole the help of the architects can be counted upon and should be drawn in for service on the boards. Few other people are able to read plans sufficiently well to be sure of what they mean.

The term “architectural control” has now been used internationally for more than twenty years and it does not seem likely to be changed. For it expresses the handling of one of the world’s greatest problems, common to cities of other countries as well as our own. It was my privilege to be a member for several years of the Committee on Architectural Control of the International Federation for Housing and Town Planning. The many bulletins brought out between 1926 and 1934 give the illuminating experience of many different countries which have been trying to find an answer to this serious problem. Some ingenious methods have been employed, but all these efforts bog down unless competent enforcement is established.

The most notable forward step for architectural control in this country has been taken by the Federal Housing Administration. It insures an increasing number of mortgage loans made by banks to finance new construction. Once the financiers of America really understand the serious depreciation caused to owner or lender, not only by a badly-designed building, but also by an unattractive, off-color neighborhood, the evil is bound to be stopped as far as possible at its source.

FHA is a sound business institution risking no avoidable error. It takes two precautions. It exercises its own architectural control on the plans that come before it for financing. Also it carefully appraises the amenities of the neighborhood where the proposed structure will be located. If the neighborhood has much bad architecture or is otherwise

unattractive or lacking in amenities and conveniences, the loan is reduced accordingly. Many neighborhoods cannot get loans, particularly in the old and deteriorated districts or where the zoning is faulty.

Such procedure is already having a marked effect on lenders who do not take out FHA insurance and, of course, on the development of cities where FHA operates on a large scale. This is true in Los Angeles and many other California communities. The process is slow. Cities desirous of stopping any considerable proportion of bad architecture in new structures will have to set up architectural boards of review under the police power, to pass on all plans for which building permits are sought.

That cities and counties have the right to exercise architectural control for the general welfare, under the police power granted by the Constitution of the United States, and by most of the states, there is little doubt. The courts have been leaning more in that direction, though we have no clear-cut decision on it as yet.

Some of you will remember that the situation was much the same with zoning twenty-five years ago. We had to feel our way, be cautious about contests or causes of contests until we could show the courts that we had tried zoning and that it worked. It is only twenty-five years ago that we ventured to establish the first single-family dwelling zones, protected from the invasion of apartments and multiple dwellings. Seven years later such an ordinance was upheld by the United States Supreme Court for the first time.

Reasonableness is about the only limit on the use of the police power by public bodies, the courts have held. It is only reasonable then that the great economic and social evils in urban amenities and their public regulation through architectural control should soon be recognized and fully sustained by the highest courts.

There are dangerous tendencies in the present trend of enforcement that may not only discredit but even prejudice the courts. Planning commissions are not qualified nor properly constituted to act as architectural boards of review. They seldom have more than one member who can read the plans presented to them. If they accept the responsibility now being placed upon them by some zoning ordinances they have to depend upon draftsmen to look over the plans, to consult with designers or owners about them, and to advise the board for action. This is a left-handed and weak method, and can hardly have the respect and confidence of the architects and designers who make the plans. Their cooperation is essential to any proper degree of enforcement.

The alternative is for the commissions to set up competent architectural boards of review, first in an advisory capacity if necessary, but with official and established status as soon as possible.

The Santa Barbara ordinance of 1925 (later repealed), establishing a thoroughly competent architectural board of review, is probably the best of the halfway measures so far attempted. It was published in full in the

proceedings of the National Conference on City Planning, Washington, D. C., 1927.

So serious and far-reaching is this problem that the following resolution for bringing in further reports to this conference is respectfully submitted: Resolved that the governing board of this body is requested to establish as soon as possible a standing committee of five members, to serve for three years, for the purpose of gathering data on the cost to property owners and the public of the lack of architectural control, and to bring to public attention all constructive methods for its establishment, operation and maintenance, and to report from time to time thereon to this Conference.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

REPORTER: Glenn A. Rick, *City Planning Engineer, San Diego.*

DISCUSSION LEADERS: Albert S. Bard, *Vice-Chairman, National Roadside Council.*

Russell V. Black, *Consultant, New Jersey State Planning Board.*

H. J. Friedman, *County and Zoning Engineer, Glynn County, Georgia.*

Mrs. Ralph A. Reynolds, *Chairman, California Roadside Council.*

Mr. Bard, in comment upon Miss James's paper, read a comprehensive statement recommending specialized strip zoning along highways as the only possible way of resolving the conflict between the rights of the traveling public and those of the private owner of land abutting upon the highway. Planners have tended, Mr. Bard felt, to object to any zoning unless it was "comprehensive," thereby failing to take advantage of the most effective method of modern highway control.

The "comprehensive zoner" has failed to note several important facts, Mr. Bard stated. In the first place, he has not realized that comprehensive zoning, appropriate to complex urban communities, has itself utilized the principle of strip-zoning: "The allocation of a particular street and its abutting premises to business or residential uses, to one-family houses, to apartments, or to any other special use, is in essence strip-zoning—necessary and desirable." In the second place, if the land uses in a transportation corridor 1,000 or 2,000 feet wide, with a highway down the middle, are regulated it makes no practical difference to the users of the highway or to the owners of the side strips whether the hinterland beyond the corridor is mapped for agriculture, pasturage, orchards, forestry, or wild land. "You may deal with the transportation corridor or with the hinterland," he said, "but whether you deal with one or the other depends upon

wholly different considerations; there is no such unity of problem or of subject matter as demands necessarily concurrent regulation, desirable as that may be at times." Finally, the comprehensive zoner has failed to note that "there is no difference in law or in economics between (1) regulating land uses on one side of a dividing line and dubbing the land on the other side 'unrestricted,' and (2) applying those same regulations to the terrain on the one side of the line and saying nothing whatever about the other side. Both are equally zoning. But the first case has been supposed to supply a quality of 'comprehensiveness' lacking in the second."

Mr. Bard emphasized the close relationship of the highway and its side-strips, and the remote relationship of the modern highway and the hinterland beyond the transportation corridor, because it seemed to him as if a good many planners felt that "comprehensiveness in zoning supplied a quality whose omission might damage the scheme. Unless comprehensiveness is immediately demanded by the needs of the case, it is a weakness, not a strength. . . . The need for highway zoning, to save our highways from becoming ribbon slums everywhere, is obvious the country over, now. That protective step need not await elaborate surveys of great areas and their assignment, in large schemes, to particular land uses, desirable and ultimately inevitable as these may be."

Mr. Bard cited, as evidence in support of his thesis, Chief Justice Rugg's decision in the Massachusetts billboard case in which the conflict was recognized to be between travelers and billboard tenants of the side strips; the hinterland was in no way involved.

In discussing remedies for a situation in which the public makes enormous outlays for highways and yet has no control over their appearance, Mr. Bard suggested that, since parkways will always be only a small part of our road mileage, "any great and general improvement must come about through a control of the abutting strips along the more ordinary highways." He felt that state and county regulation may both be resorted to and that they are not mutually exclusive.

Mr. Bard agreed with Miss James's suggestion for "zoning or control through the police power," affirming that zoning is an exercise of police power.

As one method of dealing with the highway control problem, Mr. Bard suggested the use of the interim ordinance—an emergency measure laying down certain fundamental restrictions to head off the rush of exploiters to get in ahead of any carefully worked-out zoning plan before it is put into effect. This form of control has been used to good effect in California.

Mr. Bard stated: "As a result of new methods of travel and circulation—automobile, bus, airplane—thousands of eyes now look at towns and countrysides that were formerly viewed by a few. The importance of appearance has multiplied enormously." The new realization of the need for public planning, including as one of its elements the factor of

design, will ultimately reach the courts and color their decisions concerning the rights of the private owner, as a private owner and as a member of the community. On the basis of the decisions in several recent cases, Mr. Bard felt that "the old cases which barred esthetics as a basis for the exercise of the police power were wrong. . . . The need is for small and reasonable restraints upon private property in the interests of civic and public design in planning."

Mr. Black, in his discussion, expressed doubt as to the efficacy of any known method of architectural control. This did not mean, he insisted, that he felt that any efforts to better the existing order should be spared. He, too, made a plea for more effective weapons against the causes of ugliness along our highways.

Mr. Friedman, whose paper was read by Mr. Rick, felt that the main problems of roadside control arise along state highways where travel is heaviest and commercial uses, including advertising signs, are greatest. "The county as a unit for control of the state highway corridors," he stated, "has not, except in isolated cases, proven effective. Comparatively stringent regulations still permit some undesirable uses. For example, in the control of advertising signs in connection with our zoning ordinance in Glynn County, Georgia, we require that no advertising sign shall be placed within 150 feet of the center of the road, or within 500 feet of a public road intersection, school, park, church, cemetery, another advertising sign, or at a curve. Also, our planning board has authority to designate areas of scenic beauty or historic interest where no advertising signs are permitted. Yet on a recently completed roadside improvement project we have been compelled to grant several permits for billboards that definitely mar the roadside.

"Until the weight of public opinion forces action," Mr. Friedman added, "it is believed that statewide control by zoning or licensing, under the supervision of state highway departments or state patrols, will not prove successful."

Some practical means, however, must be found to provide control quickly and uniformly over the increasingly acute problems of objectionable roadside structures, billboards, ribbon business slums, automobile junk yards, and so forth. Mr. Friedman felt that the first attack should be made through new construction or reconstruction. He suggested that when rights-of-way are secured on new highway projects "a clause could be inserted controlling the erection of advertising signs on the adjacent lands. Clauses limiting access to the highways, providing proper setbacks for new structures and controlling areas in which business uses are permitted, could also be included." Such a plan might mean some increase in the cost of acquiring rights-of-way but it probably need never be very high. Mr. Friedman further suggested that "standard clauses for inclusion in right-of-way deeds could be prepared covering these features. Simple state legislation could be enacted supporting the procedure and

providing legal support where condemnation must be resorted to." This method has been successfully used by several state highway departments and by the Public Roads Administration in its construction of the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway.

In summing up, Mr. Friedman said, "The results in a matter of a few years would, it is believed, arouse popular sentiment to a point where statewide comprehensive legislation could be passed and effectively enforced." This could then be supplemented by the phases of control outlined in Miss James's paper and would constitute the foundation for the approach to control along existing old highways. "Factors necessary toward attaining success are a simple, easily understood program, educational work and securing cooperation of all land owners and citizens."

With public opinion aroused, Mr. Friedman asserted, formulae can be established for liquidating non-conforming uses on the basis of amortization of the original cost.

"As roadside control becomes more general," Mr. Friedman concluded, "it is felt that architectural control, so far as roadside structures are concerned, will follow closely under the same general setup of use of the police power by planning or architectural boards." In this connection, Glynn County, Georgia, has had some success in assisting builders in preparing satisfactory and attractive designs for roadside structures.

Mrs. Reynolds discussed the progress made in California through the California Roadside Council and other organizations. She suggested that further legislation was necessary to create restricted commercial areas. She pointed out the effectiveness of visual education in arousing public opinion, and invited the planners to see the film prepared by her organization, showing the relative results of planning and lack of planning along California highways.

A Program for the Use of Tax-Abandoned Land

HAROLD S. BUTTENHEIM
Editor, The American City

By claiming land the lucky among our pioneer forefathers acquired individual wealth; by reclaiming either the land or its socially created income must their successors—lucky and unlucky—help to make community well-being more prevalent and permanent.

Through the era of America's first settlement the land-gambler's survival may not have been an unmixed evil. But with the end of that era his failure to become extinct or fully domesticated was an oversight which the era of America's resettlement must find means to correct.

For it is into an era of resettlement and reclamation that we are now entering. This era will involve, in the decades immediately ahead, not only the conservation and redevelopment of vast rural regions, but the rebuilding of large areas in most American cities. To fell the trees in the primeval forests was the task of our colonial pioneers. To fell the tenements and the shacks in our obsolete urban jungles is the task of their descendants.

To the task of the forest-clearer the lure of free land was a potent stimulus. To the task of the slum-clearer the lure of increased public or cooperative ownership of land, combined with a rational tax system, might be equally potent. In the 1940's our municipal and county governments will be shortsighted indeed if they fail to pick up bargains in their own tax-delinquent real estate and to use such acquisitions in the public interest, rather than to allow the old game to continue of the buying up and subsequent exploitation of distressed properties by land-gamblers.

Two major questions: In an effort to secure some up-to-date information for this paper, I asked several planners, tax officials, and others for data as to:

1. The best and worst features of existing state laws relating to the public acquisition of tax-delinquent land and the powers of local governments to use, lease or sell such land.
2. Present practice or needed improvement of method in bringing such land into public use or restoring it to a taxpaying status.

Before attempting to formulate my own program, I want to quote excerpts from some of the replies received. As we are meeting on the Pacific Coast, I suggest that we start in the West and travel East.

Statement by Benjamin H. Kizer, Chairman, Washington State Planning Council: There are few "best features" of existing state laws pertaining to tax-delinquent lands. This for the reason that little or no thought has been given to the matter. Nature just takes its course.

In our state the county treasurer on behalf of the county, state, city and school district collects all real and personal property taxes. When property has been delinquent for five years, it is sold and bought in by the county unless some private party bids for it, which is not frequent. Tax-delinquent lands are managed by the board of three county commissioners, usually two farmers and one city man, but, in any event, men entirely unacquainted with city problems, although five-sixths of the population of the county and at least 75 per cent of the delinquent property is located in the city of Spokane.

County commissioners change frequently. They are poorly paid and the men elected to office are almost invariably without political experience. As each group comes in, the bright idea occurs to them—something no one else in their experience has ever thought of—to show some enterprise in selling tax-reverted lands at *any* price just so as to get them back on the county's tax rolls. They sell some, not as much as they expected, at ridiculously low prices. The rural land is nearly all marginal and in due time wanders back as tax-delinquent land. Its second foreclosure sometimes costs as much as ever was taken in by the sale, for the purchaser merely roosts on the land without paying taxes once he has bought it for a song, and five years later it is tax delinquent again.

The sale of city lands in this wholesale fashion usually knocks down other realty values in the vicinity, and the result is a reduction in taxable values that loses more in annual revenue than is gained either by the sale of the property or the possibility that it will bring in a little tax revenue.

By the time a group of county commissioners has been educated by such a procedure, they go out of office and the whole dreary course of enterprise and stupidity runs its course again.

So far as marginal rural lands are concerned, each state should make a careful land-use survey and should retire its marginal lands rather than to sell them to some poor sucker on the gamble by the county that he will starve to death trying to live there. The county wins the gamble too often. As to all city and county lands, the assessor and treasurer should sit with the chairman of the board of county commissioners as a group to develop policies of sale, since these men are usually more experienced and have a wider background of knowledge of what ought to be done than do the county commissioners. It would aid, of course, if the state board of tax commissioners, which develops state policies and has more continuity than any local official, had some measure of control over the sale of tax-reverted lands, or in a given case over their transfer to the state to be used for forest projects, recreation, etc. Actually the values of land remaining in private ownership would advance if these marginal lands were

retired from use. The city and county tax revenues would be thereby increased and the unwary would not be tempted to part with their meager savings to acquire worthless land.

Statement by T. S. Hedges, Commissioner, Washington State Tax Commission: The problem of the use of tax-abandoned land begins, in our opinion, long before the land becomes tax-abandoned. In other words, much of the land that is foreclosed for taxes or for local improvements has either been assessed at too high a value or the improvement assessments that have been placed upon it have added a weight of cost that the land will not economically stand . . . There is a rather too common belief on the part of assessors that because one piece of property, either in a city or in the county, sells at a certain sum, all other similar property in the neighborhood is of equivalent value. This idea must always be modified in proportion to the possible use of the total area available and this angle is all too frequently not considered . . .

It may be said, however, that the laws of many states make it obligatory, to a greater or less extent, that the state furnish services to all of its citizens, partly in the way of roads, schools, etc. When persons settle in remote and sparsely populated areas and then demand the same type of services that are given in more congested areas, the price of such services, per unit, is very greatly augmented. Naturally, far-sighted officials tend to discourage settlement in areas where governmental service costs are apt to be extremely high.

The laws in different states governing the public acquisition of tax-delinquent land vary greatly. We think that we may say that Washington is in rather better position in this regard than most states, though perhaps not quite so fortunate as a few. . . . Property in Washington is very seldom foreclosed until the taxes upon it are at least five years delinquent and we think the people of this state, practically always, have an ample spread of time within which to protect themselves against foreclosure, if their economic circumstances or the land itself warranted the original investment. Tax titles in this state are exceptionally good and title insurance is readily issued upon them.

Statement by R. E. Riley, Commissioner of Finance, City of Portland, Oregon: (Commissioner Riley sends me a copy of an address on "Getting Delinquent Properties Back on the Tax Roll," which he delivered before the annual conference of the Municipal Finance Officers' Association of the United States and Canada in August 1938, with figures revised to May 15, 1940. Excerpts from this paper follow.)

"In Oregon, when owners fail to pay general taxes on their property, it is, after due process of law, sold by the county for such taxes. When the property is sold by the county at tax sale it is offered to private purchasers. If there are no private bidders, then all property remaining unsold is struck off to the county in lieu of delinquent taxes.

"The Supreme Court of Oregon has ruled that this sale to the county

wipes out all other interests, including the claims of municipalities for local assessments. Since the property is the security for the outstanding improvement bonds, the city cannot stand by and allow the property to be sold to the county, thereby wiping out its lien. Briefly, this explains how the city of Portland got into the real estate business. . . .

"By means of a charter amendment in 1918 there was created an assessment collection fund with a capital of \$1,500,000 as a rotating fund to facilitate the collection of delinquent improvement assessments. This fund is managed by the delinquent tax bureau, which is headed by the commissioner of finance by appointment of the mayor. One of the first problems of this bureau was to find ways and means through the city's legal department to build a plan which would perfect the legal title to these properties and make them marketable. The city attorney assigned one of his deputies to this particular task, who, with a staff of four persons, is slowly clearing up these titles.

"The next step was to market the properties. Originally the bureau endeavored to market the property through special authorized real estate agents. This method was successful in a fair measure, and the city was able to market a large number of its best holdings.

"About five years ago the bureau made it possible for any licensed real estate broker to sell city-owned property, and, considering the small demand for real estate during the past few years, this method was fairly satisfactory.

"It was felt, however, that if the city of Portland were to manage its own sales through giving personal attention to this work, the volume of sales might be increased. Therefore, a real estate department was established by the bureau under the direct supervision of the city treasurer, with an experienced real estate sales manager and staff set up to devote their entire time to the matter of sales . . .

"In order to encourage buyers of city-owned property, the city gives the buyer a very liberal contract with a carrying charge of 6 per cent. As large a down payment as possible is obtained, however, and no contract is drawn until at least 25 per cent of the sale price has been paid. This does not mean that property is not sold for less than a 25 per cent down payment, but only when sufficient monthly payments have been made to accumulate 25 per cent of the sale price is a contract delivered. These liberal arrangements are an inducement to persons who are in the market for modest-priced lots on which they may build modest-priced homes. The contracts are drawn for varying periods of time. Most of them are payable in two or three years and seldom is one drawn for a longer period than five years. The length of time allowed a purchaser to pay for a piece of property is governed largely by the amount of the purchase price . . .

"The result of the activity on the part of the city of Portland in dispos-

ing of this property shows itself in many ways. It is taking non-producing property and placing it back on the assessment rolls, thereby increasing the taxable income of the city and further reducing property taxes. Inasmuch as it is estimated that 80 per cent of the property thus sold is improved, the new wealth created is considerable. Millions of dollars are expended in building materials, plumbing and electrical fixtures, paint, electrical appliances, water, gas and electricity consumption, all of which means additional jobs and positions created for Portland citizens . . .

"During the calendar year 1939 a total of 559 lots were sold by the city real estate department for a total of \$122,300. From January 1 to May 15, 1940, lot sales totalled 509, and the sales prices \$97,925."

Statement by L. Deming Tilton, Administrative Officer, California State Planning Board: (On May 24, 1940, the California legislature enacted a law¹ which for the first time establishes in that state a carefully formulated plan for reducing tax delinquency and handling tax-deeded land. This legislation, although Mr. Tilton's letter modestly refrains from saying so, represents a real achievement for the California State Planning Board; for the complications of the previous law under which California dealt with tax-abandoned land were emphasized, and proposals on which the new legislation was largely based were presented, in a comprehensive report of the California State Planning Board, published in 1938.)

From an article entitled "A New Approach to Tax Delinquency" by William G. Smith, in *The American City* for June, 1940, compiled from data furnished by Mr. Tilton, the following paragraphs are quoted:

"This law among other things provides a three-member land classification commission to classify all tax-deeded land in the state . . .

"The distribution of this land indicates that 19 counties out of the 58 in the state have approximately three-fourths of the tax-deeded land, or 2,655,088 acres. Twenty-four cities have over 1,000 lots tax-deeded to the state, but only three, San Diego with 31,895, Los Angeles with 25,307, and Fresno with 10,128, have over 5,000 lots and constitute the main urban problems . . .

"The commission classified land into three categories: (1) suited for private ownership and to be sold for that purpose as soon as possible; (2) suited for public ownership; (3) waste land. Any public agency can request that certain parcels be classified for public ownership . . .

"The commission may rent all land until it has been classified or, following classification, until its disposal. All classifications, prior to disposal, are subject to reclassification. The income from these rentals will serve to meet the administrative expenses of the commission. Whenever waste land is found to be rehabilitated sufficiently to justify its reclassification as either private or public use land, the commission makes this classification.

¹ Signed by the governor and recorded as Chapter 47 of the Statutes of the Special Session of 1940.

This waste land is analyzed and suggestions for its rehabilitation are made to the appropriate public agencies. It may be rented during the rehabilitation process.

"The right of redemption, which has served to cloud tax-delinquency deeds, is clearly stated. Beyond a period of five years' delinquencies, during which certain notices and warnings are issued, the right of redemption automatically ceases and the property becomes tax-deeded to the state. Adequate and liberal repayment procedures protect the delinquent holder, enabling him to redeem his property before the expiration of the five-year period."

Statement by L. A. Henry, Engineer-Director, Arkansas State Planning Board: (Act No. 331 of the Arkansas Acts of 1939, commonly referred to as the State Land Policy Act, establishes a policy for the handling of tax-reverted lands and other state-owned lands in Arkansas. Mr. Henry sends me an article on "The New State Land Policy" by C. O. Brannon, Assistant Director of Research of the Arkansas Agricultural Experiment Station, as published in *The Arkansas Farmer* for June 1939. From this article the following paragraphs are quoted.)

"The land is to be inspected and classified to determine whether it is suitable for private ownership or whether it should be retained by the state, and also to determine, in case it is found suitable for private ownership, whether it should be set aside as homestead land for settlement by farmers or whether it should be sold for other purposes. If it is classified as homestead land, it is donated by the state to settlers. If it is classified as non-homestead land, it is then subject to sale at its appraised value. If the land is not suitable for homestead or sale to private individuals, it may be allocated to state agencies, subject to their consent, for state forests, state parks, or other public purposes . . .

"All state land which is not suitable for homestead purposes, and which is not considered suitable for continued state ownership, may be sold to the highest bidder.

"Previously, any land in the state up to 160 acres could be donated for homestead purposes, irrespective of whether the tract was large enough or productive enough to support a farm family. The result has been that misled farmers would donate land, later find the land unsuitable for farming, and allow it again to forfeit for taxes. Similarly, the land could be sold for a dollar per acre, even though the land was worth much more than that. It has been common practice, also, where state land had marketable timber, for investors to purchase the land at a dollar per acre, cut the timber immediately, and then allow the land again to forfeit for taxes. Whether the land was retained by the purchaser or exploited and returned to the state, the state government has been losing large amounts of wealth and revenue because of the lack of a better method of handling state land.

"The administration continues under the authority of the commissioner of state lands. The classification of lands, however, is the responsibility of the land-use committee of the state planning board. The state land commissioner may call upon this committee, and upon other state and federal agencies whose regular functions require an understanding of land qualities and land classification, for assistance in inspection, classification and appraisal."

Statement by A. B. Horwitz, City Planning Engineer of Duluth, Minnesota: The Minnesota laws provide that when a parcel of land has against it unpaid taxes for five years, the county board shall serve sixty days' notice of pending forfeiture. The county auditor may serve one year's notice at the end of the fourth year. If the owner fails to redeem within the time specified, title reverts to the state, which holds it in trust for the several taxing units . . .

Chapter 328 of the Laws of Minnesota for 1939 provides that upon the forfeiture of land to the state for non-payment of taxes, the county board shall classify such land as "conservation" or "non-conservation." Parcels classified as "conservation" are withheld from sale and continue under the supervision of the county board. Parcels classified as "non-conservation" are offered for sale, at prices not less than the minimum fixed by the county board for purposes of such sale. This law provides "that if any such lands are located within the boundaries of any organized town or incorporated municipality, the classification or reclassification shall first be approved by the town board of such town, or the governing body of such municipality," thus giving the municipality control over its own tax-forfeited land.

The law contains a broad basis for withholding tax-reverted parcels from sale to private parties. It provides that land "classification shall be made with consideration, among other things, to the present use of adjacent land, the productivity of the soil, the character of forest or other growth, accessibility of lands to established roads, schools, and other public services, and their peculiar suitability or desirability for particular uses. Such classification, furthermore, shall aim: to encourage and foster a mode of land utilization that will facilitate the economical and adequate provision of transportation, roads, water supply, drainage, sanitation, education, and recreation; to facilitate reduction of governmental expenditures; to conserve and develop natural resources; and to foster and develop agriculture and other industries in the districts and places best suited thereto." In other words, any properties which, judged by the standards here enumerated, should be held in public ownership permanently or temporarily, are to be classified as "conservation lands." Such land may be sold, however, to a governmental subdivision, which subdivision must pay the amount set by the county board.

The county board may lease, for periods not to exceed one year, tax

forfeited lands classified as "conservation" or as "non-conservation," and may sell products, such as hay stumpage or mature timber. The county may demolish any buildings or structures upon such land.

Desirable amendments to the state law include:

1. A provision to permit the exchange of tax-forfeited parcels for privately-owned parcels, to make possible the consolidation or enlargement of existing publicly-owned areas and the consolidation of tax-forfeited areas for the vacation of premature plats and for the best disposition and use.
2. A provision to permit the planting of trees in large units of tax-forfeited areas. Planting may be possible through the CCC program. Such planting of large areas not needed for immediate use is likely to prove advantageous, regardless of the future disposition of the land.
3. A provision to permit municipalities to obtain title to land needed for permanent public use, without payment for same.
4. A provision to permit municipalities to make needed temporary use of such land in cases in which the municipality does not deem it desirable to take title.

In the city of Duluth there are approximately 85,000 parcels which are taxable. Of this number, some 25,000 parcels reverted to the state in 1939, about 11,000 parcels will revert in 1940, and about 5,000 parcels are likely to revert during the succeeding two or three years. Thus, approximately 41,000 parcels, out of the city's total of 85,000 parcels, will be held by the state. It is unlikely that more than 5,000 to 10,000 parcels will be bought for private use. This is due to the fact that Duluth, a city of 100,000 population, has within its corporate limits sufficient land for a population of perhaps 300,000, much of which land is not suited for agriculture. Our problem, therefore, is to restrict the sale of tax-forfeited lands to areas which will not result in uneconomical extension of public services or in net loss in taxable values.

Suggested disposition of tax-forfeited land:

1. The blocking out of large unsettled areas against immediate sale to private owners; the consolidation of such areas through exchange of lands; wherever suitable, the forestation or reforestation of these areas. (To constitute a public land reserve.)
2. Reservation of land required in the master plan for large parks, playgrounds, street extensions, and other public uses.
3. The establishment of suitable permanent municipal forests.
4. The reservation of adequate park strips along major highways for traffic safety, highway beautification, the prevention of billboards and other disfiguring uses along the highways, the prevention of uneconomical strip development.
5. The rounding out of existing public areas through the reservation of tax-forfeited parcels and through the exchange of tax-forfeited parcels for privately-owned parcels.
6. The vacation of premature subdivisions.

7. The limitation of sale of parcels to areas which will not result in uneconomical extension of public services or in net loss in community taxable values.

Tax-forfeited land is land in public ownership. The most effective control of land use is that applicable to publicly-owned land. Tax-forfeited land thus constitutes an important tool for effective planning.

Statement by Howard M. Hall, Assistant County Attorney, Polk County Real Estate Board, Des Moines, Iowa: (Mr. Hall's letter quotes the text of the statute, enacted in 1935, under which the county purchases and disposes of tax-delinquent property (now Sections 7255.1 and 10260.4 of the 1939 Code of Iowa) and states that approximately 95 per cent of all properties sold under this law are vacant lots located in the city of Des Moines. Property sold by the Polk County Real Estate Department on which purchase price was collected in 1939 totaled 694 parcels at an aggregate sales price of \$66,881—\$6,465 in excess of general tax, interest, costs and penalties. During the same year permits issued for construction on vacant lots sold by the county numbered 186, with a combined building value of \$553,000. In describing procedure subsequent to acquiring a tax title to property, Mr. Hall writes as follows.)

After acquiring a tax title to property, the first matter we determine is whether or not such property can be put to any public use either in the form of parkways, parks, public building sites, extension of streets and alleys and highways, or for any other public purpose. If such property can be converted to public use, we do so by conveying the same to the taxing body which has supervision of that particular branch of our governmental affairs. Examples of this have been as follows:

We acquired a large greenhouse which we conveyed to the city of Des Moines and which is now being used by the city as its municipal greenhouse for the growing of all flowers for city parks.

We conveyed to the city a large tract in the center of Des Moines with a natural lake which has been converted and is now known as a municipal park and will be developed as one of the finest parks in Des Moines. We have followed the Bartholomew plan of developing parkways throughout Des Moines and have conveyed hundreds of lots to the city in carrying out a parkway program.

We conveyed sites to our hospital trustees for an additional hospital site together with an extensive expanding program of their hospital grounds.

Many street developments have been effected by conveyances of property to the city which avoided the necessity of condemning private property.

We term our scavenger tax sale law, wherein the county acquires title for the use and benefit of the other taxing bodies, as a public bidder law. One of the main purposes of the enactment of the law was to stop the vicious practice of conspiracy of various persons to buy each other's

property at tax sale for a nominal figure and take tax deeds and in that fashion cut out the revenue that came from general taxes. Also the good faith purchase of property at the scavenger tax sales was defeating the general taxes spread against the properties.

The public bidder law also encourages taxpayers to pay their taxes before they become delinquent and needless to say, private buyers are now compelled to bid a sum equal to the sum of general taxes, interest, costs and penalties before they can become the bidder at the tax sale.

We have sold many of the cheaper lots to people of very modest means who might otherwise be unable to afford a building program. By that I mean we have sold many vacant lots for \$50 on which the purchaser has built a modest home. Thus he becomes a property owner and a much better citizen . . .

We have at all times been fair with the former owners and former mortgage holders and any other lienholders, in that after acquiring tax deeds to our properties we in turn contact the former owners and any lienholders that we may find asking that they repurchase this property from the county for the exact amount of the general taxes, interest, costs and penalties. We have in this manner helped save the equities which hundreds of people have had in their properties, more particularly those holding mortgages, not knowing that the general tax on the real estate had not been paid . . .

Although we are proud of the record which has been made there are many things that are still far from perfect. One chief difficulty after acquiring tax deeds is to obtain a merchantable title. Because our courts have been so prone to set aside tax deeds, lawyers examining titles based on tax deeds have required actions to be brought and a confirmation of the tax title by our courts, or that a quit-claim deed be obtained from the former owner before the title can be approved. This has necessitated much work and considerable delay in perfecting these titles.

Statement by Charles B. Bennett, City Planner, and Arthur M. Werba, Supervisor of the Division of Tax Enforcement, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: The city of Milwaukee so far has acquired some 3,000 vacant lots through tax deed action. Fortunately, the laws of Wisconsin are simple and effective. Under our state laws current unpaid taxes are sold immediately. The sale is evidenced by the issuance of a tax certificate which becomes eligible for tax deed action after a lapse of five years (provided it is not redeemed in the intervening time).

The disposal of tax-deed-acquired lots is likewise regulated by simple methods prescribed by common council resolution. After completion of the action to quiet title the city real estate agent takes possession of the lots. Before the agent, who is an employee of the city planning commission, places any foreclosed tax-delinquent properties on the "For Sale" list, they are referred to the city planner so that he may check the question of

whether or not any part or all of the parcel involved is needed for any present or possible future public use. All such parcels are referred to the unofficial master plan before a determination is made. We have found this system very effective in retaining many parcels of land needed by the city for future street widenings, parks, playgrounds, et cetera.

The city of Milwaukee has 30,000 vacant lots within its limits, and 34,000 vacant lots just beyond the limits—a supply, based on normal needs, that would last for the next fifty years to come.

In selling foreclosed tax-delinquent properties the city is maintaining a fair price on them, rather than resorting to the auction method—taking what we could get thereby, which procedure would not only demoralize the local real estate market but our tax assessments as well. Under the auction method most of these lots would find their way into the hands of speculators who, if they could not immediately turn them over at a profit, would let tax payments slide and the city would again have to go through the process of tax foreclosure. Altogether, we think we have devised a very efficient system for handling foreclosed properties here in Milwaukee.

Statement by Clarence W. Lock, Executive Secretary, Michigan State Land Board: (Under the State Land Board Act of Michigan—No. 155 of the Public Acts of 1937, as amended in 1939, now under attack in the state supreme court—Mr. Lock reports the following activity.)

The state acquired title, on November 3, 1939, to some 520,000 parcels because of the failure to redeem said lands from the 1938 tax sale. On February 13, 1940, the state opened a sale of these lands in each county under the jurisdiction of the state land office board. Counties in the northern part of the state do not come under the supervision of the board, but lands in those counties are administered by the lands division of the department of conservation.

Up to May, 1940, the board has completed its offering of these properties in all except four of the counties under their control, and in these counties the sale is still continuing and will undoubtedly continue until this fall. Wayne County, for instance, had 251,000 properties involved, and we find that we are unable to offer more than 1,200 or 1,500 parcels daily. We have now offered 160,000 parcels, out of which 60,745 have been sold for a total amount of \$4,593,633. We have, likewise, collected, since last November, \$244,507 in rentals on properties which have reverted to the state.

Statement by H. G. Crow, City Manager, St. Joseph, Michigan: (In reply to an inquiry as to how the State Land Board Act is working, Mr. Crow wrote me under date of May 25, 1940.)

I know very little about how satisfactorily the law is working in the northern part of the state, and all of my comments and criticisms will be with reference to the law as it applies to the southern part of the state. I was a member of the Michigan Municipal League's committee when

this law was enacted, and later in 1939 when we attempted to have certain amendments enacted which we thought would make the law more workable. Some changes we were able to obtain, and some we were unable to prevail upon the legislative committee to consider.

The law provides that in May of each year any uncollected taxes of two years' delinquency are sold. If there are no bidders on these taxes and they are still delinquent eighteen months after that date, the state takes title to the property and in the following February the property is sold at auction to the highest bidder. Any party in interest (party in interest defined as owner of record, mortgage holder, bondholder, or any other interested party) may within thirty days after date of sale elect to meet the highest bid and take the property by paying that amount. He may also elect to pay the amount over a period not to exceed ten years, with interest at 6 per cent on the unpaid balance. The property must be sold for a minimum of 25 per cent of the assessed valuation of the year preceding the vesting of title in the state.

The law had been well publicized and there was a good deal of interest in it. As many buyers as could be expected were attracted to the sales. However, human nature is to get what you want at as low a price as possible. The bidding was usually as follows: If an outside bidder of interest were present and the original owner were present, the original owner would make a minimum bid, and the outsider would make a small raising bid, which ended the bidding. The party in interest then within a thirty day limit would meet the bid and take the property. If the outside party made the first bid, and usually the minimum bid, the interested party would not bid but would again meet the bid within thirty days. This tended to hold the bidding down, as oftentimes the outside bidders would have bid the sale price up much nearer the delinquent taxes, if there had been competition. The only time there was competitive bidding was when two or more outside parties bid in competition.

My personal recommendations would be that the law should require the party in interest to compete in the bidding and that any recognition of his prior interest be in method of payment. I feel that much more would be realized if this were the law.

In small cities where home-building activities are more or less periodic and much of the subdividing is done by owners of small tracts of vacant property, with no actual real estate experience, the tendency is to over-subdivide during active periods and hold the price of lots so high as to kill the building activity . . .

St. Joseph developed a plan which has, we feel, worked exceptionally well, although it might not be applicable to many other communities. There was a crying need for construction of homes. The factories had gradually increased their employment without any appreciable increase in the construction of homes. The owners of lots were inexperienced

subdividers who originally, in their greed for profits, had placed too high a price on their lots. In the spring of 1937, there was considerable activity in home construction. Again the owners of lots began to increase the price of their property until by midsummer this increase, with the increased prices asked by contractors, put a stop again to home building.

A group of representative, public-spirited business and professional men observing this incorporated what was known as the St. Joseph Housing Corporation, a non-profit corporation whose purpose was to aid and encourage the construction of homes in St. Joseph. They obtained a fund of \$10,000 from an old development company and this was their working capital. Their thought at the time was to buy lots, construct homes in more or less moderate mass production, and sell them at cost. They bought a group of lots and built ten homes, but did not have any great success in selling them.

At the same time that the housing corporation was building its houses, the city made a study which showed over 600 parcels of land with delinquent taxes and assessments. A campaign was started to collect as much of these as possible. Notices were sent to all owners and over 250 parcels of land were cleared of delinquencies. However, this left approximately 350 parcels with delinquencies in excess of their actual value. A plan was worked out and offered to the owners of lots which provided that they deed the lots to the city, free and unencumbered except for taxes, the city then to pay up the taxes and assessments in full, with a contract to the owner providing that the city pay them 20 per cent of the selling price if the property was sold before May 1, 1941. If not sold by that time, the city would have no further obligation to pay the owner. In all, 197 parcels of land were acquired by the city and a total payment of accumulated taxes, assessments, interest and penalty of \$76,371. However, of this amount \$72,173 represented the city's share of the payments, most of which were assessments for improvements. This left an additional investment of the city of \$4,198, or approximately \$21 per lot. This was in the spring of 1938, and to date there have been 35 lots sold for \$7200, on which are 35 new homes either completed or under construction. Home construction on privately-owned lots was stimulated. Also, there is a tract of 19 lots being used for playground purposes.

It is true that the city is in the real estate business; but it really started in that business between 1920 and 1930 when it went into partnership with the subdivider, the subdivider providing the land and the city providing the municipal improvements. When the depression hit in 1929, it ended the sale of vacant lots and many of the lots sold on contract came back to the subdividers. In the majority of cases, the subdivider had no funds to pay up the assessments as they came due and these accumulated against the property, with the added interest and penalties. It is true in St. Joseph that subdividers have practically all faded out of the picture and there is no objection from the broker, who makes his money by selling

property on a commission. The commission on a vacant lot represents little in comparison to his commission on the sale of an improved house and lot. The stimulus to building, however, has also resulted in sale of improved property. Oftentimes, the new builder is the seller of a home that did not fit his needs. Of course, the city's real estate activity has the backing of the retail merchants in that it gives them more customers, and the backing of the factories because it provides homes for their employees. It stabilizes the price of vacant property and discourages the subdividing of additional vacant property into lots until such time as building has absorbed the lots already laid out and now owned by the city.

In the tax sale for February 1940, there were 150 parcels offered. Before the sale, the industries financed the housing corporation in order that they could bid on vacant lot property. The schedule of bid prices was set up on all lots comparable with what it was thought the property should bring and what it was thought the builder of a home should pay. The housing corporation bid in 90 parcels of land, mostly lots; 50 of these were redeemed by the original owners, leaving 40 lots, which the corporation proposes to sell for immediate building at the price for which it obtained the lots.

Statement by John T. Howard, Technical Officer, Regional Association of Cleveland, Ohio: A law passed by the Ohio Legislature May 2, 1939, provides a method of public acquisition of tax-delinquent land somewhat superior to earlier Ohio procedures. It was designed for use in rural areas, especially forest or submarginal farm, but since "recreation" is one of the purposes of acquisition enumerated, it may also prove applicable to urban land. Its constitutionality has not yet been tested. Its advantages are: relative speed—land four years delinquent requires only sixty-day advertising and one sale, whence unless it brings the full amount due it comes immediately into full state ownership; local governments may buy or lease from the state agency. Its disadvantages are: uses limited to "forest reserve, game reserve, recreation or other conservation purposes"; could not be used to establish a public land reserve or for resubdivision and resale to private owners; full amount due must be paid, either when acquired or out of income from forestry.

Under older Ohio laws still in force, public agencies (local or other) can acquire clear title to tax-delinquent land for other purposes only by bidding it in at a public sale. Moreover, the process of advertising required by law is so long and expensive that only a small proportion of tax-delinquent land comes up for sale. The result is that such auctioned delinquent land as is suitable for public use is usually acquired by private speculators.

One suburb of Cleveland—Bedford—and at least one other Ohio city have nevertheless acquired a little land under this procedure for nominal amounts, with a view to resubdivision and resale or public use. The land

is mainly in vacant lots where the sum of regular taxes and special assessments far exceeds the valuation. This method needs further exploration, and the law probably needs further amendment.

A chief disadvantage of this method is that local public agencies are on exactly the same level as private buyers, principally speculators, in acquiring tax-delinquent land. The state itself, even after tax foreclosure, has no clear title and cannot use the land; it must sell, and until the land is sold it is subject to redemption by the former owner.

In 1938 Ernest J. Bohn, in a letter to a committee on tax foreclosures of the Cleveland Bar Association, outlined a policy revising the Ohio law. This policy is very much in line with a recommendation made by the California State Planning Board in its 1939 report on *Tax Delinquent Land in California*. The most important features of it are: the sharp termination of the original owner's rights in the land, after a reasonable period for redemption; and the introduction of a planning agency to determine the disposition of the forfeited property, for immediate public use, for eventual public use, for immediate lease or resale to private owners, for resubdivision, lease or resale, for rehabilitation, lease or resale, or for indefinite public reserve.

In Cuyahoga County (roughly coterminous with Greater Cleveland) as of 1939, there were approximately 375,000 parcels of property on the tax rolls. The number "certified delinquent" (one year or more) was: in 1935, 180,000; in 1936, 168,000; in 1937, 154,000; in 1938, 146,000; in 1939, 160,000. Of this last number about three-fourths were unimproved and one-fourth improved parcels. Though the trend from the depths of the depression is downward, from 58.2 per cent of all parcels delinquent in 1934 to 42.7 per cent in 1939, the proportion is still alarming. The number of unimproved parcels delinquent is especially significant. In two large suburbs of Cleveland, 80 per cent of all parcels are delinquent. They are overwhelmingly unimproved. This is the result of oversubdivision.

There is, of course, much less land that has been delinquent long enough to be considered for public seizure and disposal. At the last sale of forfeited lands, about 3,400 parcels were put up for auction—only one per cent of the total. These had all been delinquent at least four years. We know that probably twenty times as many parcels could have been put up had the expensive forfeiture proceedings been carried through. (In 1936, 111,000 out of 168,000 delinquent parcels had been delinquent four years or more.)

If foreclosure and disposal proceedings were simplified and rationalized, the Cleveland region would be able to take over and plan the disposal of between a quarter and a third of its parcels of land, largely unimproved property. (This does not mean a quarter of its area, nor of its assessed valuation, of course.)

Present practice in trying to restore such land to a taxpaying status has centered around making it easier for the owner to redeem and hold the land, through the Whittemore law which permits back taxes to be paid in ten annual installments, and through the respreading of special assessment taxes. This often just prolongs an agony of inevitably fatal ending. Needed improvements of method in bringing such land into public or productive private use have been mentioned above.

Statement by Sergei N. Grimm, Executive Director, Syracuse (N. Y.) Housing Authority: In a study of tax-delinquent parcels in Syracuse which we undertook in 1937 in correlation with the state-wide study carried out under the direction of Philip H. Cornick, we were impressed with the phenomena of simultaneous stagnation of public investment on the outskirts (in the form of delinquent taxes) and of private investment in the obsolete areas in the central part of our city.

Our study of housing demand indicated a general tendency toward positive demand in the outskirts and negative demand in blighted areas. It occurred to us that the situation could be improved by a barter arrangement, the result of which would be some transfer of private investment to the outskirts and of public investment to the heart of the city where the need for public land uses is most pressing.

We found, however, that our tax-foreclosure procedure needed improvement and the facilities of handling foreclosures had to be provided. In 1939 the New York State Tax Foreclosure Law was amended. In Syracuse a local real estate commission was established, which is now busy foreclosing parcels in the central part of the city that can be used immediately for public purposes. Simultaneously the City Planning Commission is proceeding with the classification of delinquent lots on the outskirts as to the best possible future use. After we determine what parcels should be reserved for public use, and what parcels are suitable for residential use, we should be able to try out the barter arrangement.

Incidentally, partly in connection with the study of vacant lands on the outskirts and partly in connection with the general work on the preparation of the city plan, we are considering a form of land use which is new to us in Syracuse—general reserve areas partly controlled by the city as a municipal reserve and partly privately-owned and used for agriculture and similar purposes, all of these areas to be a part of a general system of principal open spaces.

Statement by George Xanthaky, Attorney, Long Beach, New York: (Under Article 7-A of the Tax Law of New York State, which became effective October 1, 1939, any number of foreclosure actions may be consolidated in one proceeding. Its terms are analyzed quite fully by George Xanthaky, Attorney, of Long Beach, N. Y., in Chapter XIX of *Property Taxes*, published in 1940 by the Tax Policy League of New York. Mr. Xanthaky explains that the new law is the outcome of a study conducted

by a joint committee of the New York State Conference of Mayors, the New York State Bar Association, and the State Tax Commission.)

"At the outset the committee determined that it must adjust the law to the realities of the case. 'The necessity of money for the support of government' was the primary problem. The committee proceeded on the premise that there is a legal and practical distinction between a private and municipal tax lien buyer. One is a voluntary investor for profit. The other is an involuntary bidder compelled by law to protect its own taxes. One buys the cream, the other is left with the skimmed milk—liens on vacant, unimproved submarginal land. The mortgage foreclosure remedy, costing at least \$125 per action, might be a fair remedy for the private lienor; but it was far too expensive for a municipal lienor.

"It was felt that a remedy must be devised for municipalities which would eliminate the necessity of title searches, personal service, referees' fees and huge advertising costs; that an action *in rem*, directed against the land, as distinguished from the owner of the land, and in which there would be no personal judgment, was the solution to the problem.

"Under Title 1 of the act, a tax lien is defined as any unpaid tax, assessment or other legal charge, which is a lien on real property whether or not the same be evidenced by a 'transfer of tax lien,' a 'tax sale certificate,' a 'tax transcript,' a 'certificate of tax sale,' or any other written instrument. This definition is sufficiently broad to cover any debt or charge owed to the municipality regardless of the name or technical description thereof used in any local or general tax statute."

The municipality initiates the action by causing the tax collector to prepare a list of all property on which there are unpaid tax liens at least four years old. The filing of the list, duly verified, in the office of the county clerk has the same force as would the filing of separate notices and complaints under the old procedure. The new action is simple, summary, and inexpensive.

Procedure under Article 7-A by counties and municipalities is a matter of local option. A letter from H. R. Enslow, Assistant Director of Local Assessments, of the New York State Department of Taxation and Finance, reports that as of April 1940 eight counties and nine municipalities had adopted the Article, and at least fourteen other municipalities were planning to do so.

Statement by Charles L. Curran, Attorney in Charge, Bureau of Tax Lien Liquidation, Yonkers, N. Y. (In May 1936, *The American City* published an article headed "Tax Lien Foreclosure Program Aids City Planning in Yonkers." In it Theodore T. McCrosky and Charles L. Curran, then Planning Director and Assistant Corporation Counsel, respectively, of Yonkers, explained a program then being developed for restoring the potential usefulness of tax-abandoned properties through foreclosure by the city. Special consideration was given to parcels that

could be used to good advantage for public purposes and to parcels that might be resold to private parties able to pay taxes. The article listed nine important acquisitions for public use already accomplished. In reply to an inquiry as to subsequent progress, Mr. Curran writes under date of June 1, 1940.)

Since the publication of the article in May 1936, many additional properties have been acquired as a result of the program of liquidating tax liens, as follows:

A plot consisting of twenty-three acres upon which it has been tentatively planned to erect a senior high school, a junior high school and a grammar school which will have adequate playground recreation facilities attached. The section in which this property is located is growing so rapidly that the time is drawing very near when the erection of these schools will be necessary.

A second school site in a section which is growing quite rapidly and in which the school facilities at this time are not adequate.

A garage with entrances from two streets at different levels, which are to be used for storage of trucks and warehouse purposes.

A tract of land upon which has been developed a baseball field and adjacent to which another parcel of land now in process of acquisition will be available shortly for recreational purposes.

A plot which is now used for a picnic ground by private organizations at a moderate rental, and which is at all times available for a low-cost housing development.

A substantial addition to an existing park.

A parcel upon which has been erected tennis courts and another parcel in the same vicinity which will be available for a branch library whenever it is deemed necessary to establish one.

Several small parcels adjacent to school play yards which were added to play yards, thus increasing the recreational facilities of the school.

Several other parcels of land were acquired and were subsequently sold to private purchasers, the city, however, reserving to itself strips of land adjacent to the street which can be used in the future for widening purposes and the acquisition of which will substantially reduce the ultimate cost of the widening.

Statement by Hugh R. Pomeroy, Director, Virginia State Planning Board: In 1930 it was enacted by the Virginia legislature that when real estate sold for delinquent taxes and purchased by the state is not redeemed by the previous owner, his heirs or assigns, or some person having the right to charge the same with a debt, within two years from the date of the purchase, the real estate shall not be subject to further sale if the State Conservation Commission through the proper procedure applies for its use as forest land. After proper procedure the state may use such land for forest purposes, with the provision that one-fourth of the gross

returns from such use shall be paid annually to the counties in which the lands lie.

In 1938 the Code was amended to provide that when on public sale, "and no person bids the amount chargeable thereon," tax-delinquent land may be purchased "for the benefit of the state and county, city, or town, respectively."

Statement by H. C. Loeffler, Secretary, Boston Municipal Research Bureau: As of May 1940, the city of Boston has about 2,400 parcels which have been put through the land court and on which it holds absolute title. Of these slightly over 300 are improved; that is, they have structures standing on them of one sort or another. The estimated assessed valuation of all these properties is \$4,000,000. On April 30 there was \$1,302,754 owing the city in back taxes, interest, and costs.

During 1939 the city sold 136 parcels for \$106,405. The assessed valuation of these pieces was \$298,380 and \$118,406 was owing the city on them. In 1939 the city collected \$31,726 from rentals and at the close of the year there were 156 tenants. The Real Division of the Public Buildings Department still handles these problems. It was recently turned into a revenue department. Its expenses, therefore, are met from departmental earnings.

Quotation from an article by Mr. Loeffler and his associate, Richard A. Atkins, published in the national edition of the Real Estate Record of New York, for October 1, 1938: "It is a fixed principle with the law department to encourage and facilitate redemptions. Boston normally holds tax sales 18 to 20 months after the date when taxes are due. It may not exercise its right of possession until two years after deed is taken . . .

"At the discretion of the city treasurer, the redemption period may be extended for a third year, providing arrangement is made for payment in the intervening 12 months. Often the threat of foreclosure yields results where less formidable measures do not carry conviction. The law department receives overtures up to the last moment.

"After the land court determines the amounts due the city, another breathing spell of perhaps three months, as determined by the court, follows. Failing redemption, the court is petitioned to enter a decree of foreclosure, which is the equivalent of a clear title. At this point the law department's work is done, and the chief problem from there is one of real estate management . . .

"A 1938 statute . . . generally applicable to all cities and towns, vests large powers over tax title properties in the mayor or a custodian named by him. Under able administration it should make for greater flexibility. On the other hand it opens the door to unrestrained abuse by bad administration . . .

"The Real Estate Division [of the city of Boston] has made a start toward using tax title properties for municipal purposes. An ordinance

allows the transfer of possession to another city department when the mayor and council approve . . .

"The Real Estate Division has adopted the policy of withholding from sale parcels of potential use; specifically, pieces adjoining schools, fire stations, and other city property. A new development is the sequestering of parcels in areas of possible value as housing sites. Given enough such properties, they might furnish part of the local contribution to housing projects."

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In preparing this paper I have had in mind the wisecrack distinction between plagiarism and research—that plagiarism is copying from one book and research is copying from several books. So, for practically all of the material in this study, I have gone not to the shelves of libraries, but directly to some of the agencies and individuals in the forefront of current efforts for improvement in techniques and methods of changing tax-abandoned lands from community liabilities to community assets. The information given does not pretend to be comprehensive. As far as it goes, however, it is not only authoritative but is as up-to-date as a conference paper could well be, for every one of the sixteen letters quoted was written during the month of May or June, 1940.

Having acknowledged the aid of my helpful allies, it may be in order to offer some conclusions and recommendations for which no one of them can be charged with either full responsibility or full credit.

1. In a few states—notably New York, Michigan, Ohio, and Arkansas, in 1939, and California in 1940—legislation has recently been enacted for more simple, speedy and less costly procedure in the public acquisition of tax-abandoned land, and for conserving the public interest in the future disposition and use of such land. Practical experience under these laws will doubtless suggest further refinements in the states mentioned and offer helpful ideas for other states, such as Illinois, where, to quote Walter H. Blucher, "the laws are so complicated that nobody knows when property becomes tax-delinquent or what kind of title a purchaser can obtain."

2. There is a widespread and understandable desire on the part of municipal and county governments to get tax-foreclosed property back on the tax rolls. In few places, however, is adequate consideration given to the extent to which such property ought to be retained permanently in public ownership.

3. Planning boards in some states have given special study to problems involved in the excess subdivision of land and in tax-delinquency, and to the best uses to which increases in the public domain, resulting therefrom, could be put. Such studies might well be made a major activity of all state and local planning boards. Prior to foreclosure of tax-delinquent

properties it would seem advisable that they be mapped by the planning board or the municipal real estate office, if any, and charted for their best potential use—whether for retention for specific public purposes or for municipal land reserves, or for sale to private developers, or exchange for other land of greater public usefulness.

4. When public bodies sell tax-abandoned land, too little thought is usually given to such questions as (a) whether the sales price is not too low; (b) whether by thus dumping property on the market other real estate values in the city or county will not be needlessly depressed; and (c) whether the property is likely to stay sold or soon again to become tax-delinquent.

5. A comprehensive approach to problems of tax-delinquency would concern itself not only with what to do when land has become tax-abandoned, but with methods of making tax-delinquency less prevalent in future. The remedies here would include more effective control than is generally practiced over land subdivision and land use, thus discouraging settlement in either rural or urban areas which would involve needlessly expensive governmental services. In most cities legislation is needed to prohibit the sale of land in any new subdivision unless the platter has paid in advance the cost of installing all utilities and also paving, curbing and sidewalk, if needed.

6. Such a comprehensive approach would also involve less inequity in real estate assessments, more efficient methods of tax-collection (including monthly or quarterly installment payments), and a restudy of our American system of real estate taxation. The result might be the gradual adoption, under a graded tax plan, of lower rates on improvements, thus encouraging new building and the modernizing of existing structures, instead of penalizing such improvements as at present.

7. In considering possible public uses of tax-abandoned land, thought ought to be given to the need for so rebuilding our cities as to enable them to compete more efficiently than at present with the suburban trend which is everywhere evident. This would involve: larger park and playground areas; much more off-street parking space than most municipalities possess; street widenings; and in many cases the demolition and replanning of slums and blighted areas. For such uses municipal land reserves, made up partly of tax-abandoned land, would be very useful. Pending decision as to ultimate use, land reserves might be made temporary sources of public revenue by being leased—say for five years under competitive bidding—for private recreation, gardening, parking lots, or other purposes.

8. Since all municipalities own some public land and many are being increasingly forced into the real estate business, the establishment, in every large city at least, of an efficient public real estate office is to be recommended. Included in the powers of such an office might be sale for private use on a cash or credit basis; and the exchange, under proper restric-

tions, of tax-forfeited parcels for privately-owned parcels, as suggested by Mr. Horwitz, to facilitate the enlargement of publicly-owned areas and the vacation of premature subdivisions. I share also Mr. Kizer's belief, already quoted, that if marginal lands were retired from private use, the value of lands remaining in private ownership would advance in value, with a consequent increase of tax revenues.

9. The laws of many states need amendment, not only to safeguard the public interest in tax-delinquent land, but to prevent the hardships now often resulting to private owners, temporarily embarrassed financially, who suffer unjust losses at the hands of speculators in tax liens.

10. Finally, this whole problem needs much more thorough compilation of data and more definite proposals for remedies than have been possible in this study, to which the present compiler has been able to devote only a few occasional hours in the midst of other pressing duties. I am glad to learn from Carl H. Chatters and A. M. Hillhouse, of the Municipal Finance Officers' Association, that they are now working on quite a comprehensive monograph dealing with the collection of delinquent taxes and the management or disposition of tax-reverted properties. As soon as this monograph and the proceedings of our San Francisco conference are published, I believe that the four organizations affiliated with the National Conference on Planning could render an important public service by appointing a joint committee to study this whole problem of tax-abandoned land and to recommend action thereon to state and local planning boards. Merely worrying about the problem will not produce the remedies so urgently needed.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

REPORTER: Willis H. Miller, *Acting Executive Secretary, California State Planning Board.*

DISCUSSION LEADERS: Aaron B. Horwitz, *Secretary and City Planning Engineer, Duluth City Planning Department.*
Fred W. Knapp, *Secretary, Topeka Planning Board.*

Walter McC. Maitland, *New York Citizens' Housing Council.*

George W. Simons, Jr., *Jacksonville Advisory Planning Board.*

Opening the formal discussion, Mr. Aaron B. Horwitz indicated that he believed the problem of tax-abandoned land was larger than is generally realized. This was declared particularly evident when delinquent suburban property is added to that found within the city proper; a general shift of population to outlying districts makes suburban land tax-delinquency of special significance. He reviewed shortcomings of past policies

and called attention to the large percentage of delinquent land with poor improvements which is returned to the tax roll. This was characterized as being in effect the public subsidy of an exceedingly poor type of housing. Mr. Horwitz indicated his belief that tax-delinquent land can be a valuable planning tool useful in achieving many elements of the master plan. It was proposed that proper deed restrictions be applied to all parcels sold to private owners, and that laws governing the handling of tax-forfeited land be administered by technically qualified persons in a manner compatible with the highest public interest. In developing sound plans for the use and disposal of tax-deeded land, Mr. Horwitz recommended that planning agencies plot such lands on proper maps, develop specific programs for their utilization, and enlist support for these programs both from legislative bodies and the public in general.

Mr. Fred W. Knapp added a welcome touch of humor to an otherwise rather sober discussion by his vivid description of ways devised by Kansas legislators to protect the rights and privileges of non-tax-paying taxpayers. He called attention to the remarkable difference between the necessity for paying real estate taxes and the necessity for paying hotel bills, income taxes or any other type of financial obligation. As a means of reducing future land tax-delinquency it was suggested that all states through proper legislation should make the taxpayer realize his obligations and at the same time, insofar as possible, reduce the cost of government. Public objection to strict laws regarding land taxation was explained by the fact that it is a direct tax. Indirect taxes, by contrast, are paid promptly and without objection on the part of the general public.

Mr. Walter McC. Maitland expressed his belief that land tax-delinquency largely depended on three factors: (1) premature subdivision; (2) faulty system of real estate taxation; (3) inadequate control of land uses. He developed these points with examples from New York including reference to the fact that New York City now has enough land zoned for residential purposes to accommodate 77 million people, and land zoned for business adequate for 344 million people. It was Mr. Maitland's opinion that extensive delinquency could be expected to continue until realistic zoning ordinances were adopted and extended to include outlying suburban areas surrounding the cities. He further stated that city values largely are community values which properly should revert to the city, and that this point of view should be recognized in making assessments.

Mr. George W. Simons, Jr., discussed the enormous quantities of tax-delinquent land in Florida which resulted from collapse of the real estate boom in that state. Special assessment liens for paving, street lights and other public utilities were mentioned as being a primary cause of land tax-delinquency. Some Florida cities were reported to have partly solved their problem by giving free lots to any person who cared to build a \$3,000 to \$5,000 home. The importance of simplifying the payment of real estate

taxes was emphasized. St. Petersburg, which has acquired a public housing site from tax-deeded parcels, was mentioned as an example of how tax-forfeited land can be used profitably for public purposes.

During general discussion from the floor, Mr. Harold S. Osborne indicated that in New Jersey cities were reluctant to take over tax-forfeited land because the accrued taxes must be written off from the current year's income. This point was discussed by Mr. Horwitz and Mr. Rupert Mason, who observed that in most other states the back taxes due on delinquent property acquired by cities and counties is written off with no provision for refunding. Mr. Mason expressed his belief that land tax-delinquency represented a more fundamental difficulty than merely excess subdivision, and as an example called attention to the dust bowl situation. He further observed that "land on relief" is not proper in a democracy, and that under the present system of land taxation the honest taxpayer really is the forgotten man.

Mr. S. Herbert Hare raised the question as to whether the dust bowl situation might not be regarded as the result of premature subdivision of land by the federal government.

Judge Ralston suggested that a basic problem is to determine what to do with tax-forfeited land after governmental agencies get it. He warned against the futility of merely returning all such land to private ownership with the probability of its again becoming delinquent.

City Planning and Housing—May They Meet Again

TRACY B. AUGUR

Department of Regional Planning Studies, Tennessee Valley Authority

This paper rests on the simple thesis that city planning is the public's business. It is for public enterprise, not private enterprise, to say where cities shall be located, in what directions they shall grow, what their internal structure shall be. The role of private enterprise in building up the physical structure of the city must be played within this publicly determined framework.

City planning has failed in the past because the roles of public and private enterprise have been reversed. Private initiative has located cities and determined the direction and character of their growth, leaving to public enterprise the job of following along with streets, utilities and public services as best it might.

Just as the modern housing movement has for the first time acknowledged public responsibility toward the provision of adequate shelter, and divided the housing field between public and private enterprise on lines appropriate to their respective purposes, so in city planning there must be acknowledgment of the dominant public interest in the form which the nation's urban life assumes. Only then can housing and city planning meet on an effective basis.

Those of you who attended the planning conference at Buffalo eleven years ago will remember that the relationship between city planning and housing was eloquently treated on that occasion by our esteemed confrere Harold Battenheim, in his dramatic treatise "Where City Planning and Housing Meet." Turning for inspiration to his pre-stock-crash prophecies, I have found this choice salutatory tidbit. "City planning and housing meet so constantly and embrace each other so intimately as to make holy matrimony their only proper status." That statement, lifted from its context, leaves one in doubt whether Harold was offering an honorable proposal or expressing the shotgun opinion of an outraged parent. Could the birth of Radburn perhaps have led him to issue an abrupt ultimatum? Later passages in his paper, however, dispel all misgivings, and in the closing peroration one finds his true benevolence full blown. "Is it too much to hope," he asks, "that, joined in holy wedlock, these two great forces of human welfare may give birth to new and vigorous movements for making life more livable in American cities?"

The question to which we now address ourselves in retrospect is—Was it? Was it too much to hope that city planning and housing would join in a happy and productive union? A galloping poll of professional opinion reveals divergent views. Some say that when city planning lost its money in the stock crash, housing became coolly indifferent and set out on a professional career of her own. Others assert that there have been irregular meetings since that time, and claim to see strong resemblances to both in the three little Greenbelt towns. Still others admonish us to beware of malicious gossip, and say that city planning and housing were respectably married at the Buffalo conference by Father Bутtenheim himself, and have been living quietly together ever since in the Congressional Library.

Whatever the historic facts may be, it must be admitted that these two great forces of human welfare have not yet produced a new race of cities, nor made life substantially more livable in the old ones. The principal force operating to make cities what they are today is still the same force that operated so high, wide and handsome before 1929, the force of free private enterprise, unfettered by any effective guidance or control in the public interest. Neither city planning, as a directive social force determining the forms of cities, nor housing, as a force for the improvement of the basic environment of city living, has materially changed the lot of the mass of urban citizens during the past decade.

The reason for this lack of progress is found, I think, not in housing but in our obsolescent attitudes toward city planning. We have persisted in clinging to the old concept, born of village days, that cities are mere agglomerations of free private interests, to be planned accordingly, and have refused to face the reality of the complicated modern urban organism. The service which the modern city renders is a community service, rendered by the city as a city and not by its citizens as individuals. The planning of cities in a way which will enable them to render this service is a public responsibility. Yet we have based our city planning on the old village concept, preferring to approach the goal along the familiar paths of private enterprise rather than follow the less charted course of public enterprise.

There is a place for private enterprise and a place for public enterprise in the planning and building of cities. Each is geared to perform a valuable and necessary service, but the roles which they are fitted to play are different, and not interchangeable. The urban conditions which are now so universally deplored are largely due to incorrect assignments of these roles in the past, and will only be corrected by a courageous reassignment in the light of today's facts and needs. Any such reassessment of the functions of public and private enterprise will result in a substantial reversal of the roles previously played, and establish the public interest as the sole arbiter of the form which cities shall assume. We have given lip service to this idea for many years, but in practice private initiative has determined where new cities should be located, in what directions they should

grow, and what form their growth and development should take. Even in cities like Cincinnati, where some of our best measures of public direction and control have been applied, the actual effect on the determination of the city's form has been almost negligible.

The American people have heretofore been unwilling to assign to government the role of really governing the processes of urban growth. So we are where we are. And here we shall remain until we are willing to reverse our thinking and give to government, not private initiative, the power to determine how cities shall develop. It is essentially a public responsibility to say where cities shall be located, how big they shall be, what form they shall take, and what the basic plan of development shall be. Only within such a framework can private enterprise properly carry on the planning and construction of private buildings and development that contribute to a sound urban structure.

It is only too apparent what the previous reversal of these assignments has brought—city growth largely fashioned by the urge of land speculation, with public enterprise left to fill in as best it could, building and rebuilding streets in a vain effort to serve uncontrolled private development, carving needed school and recreation areas out of expensive land, expanding, scrapping, reorganizing public services to meet unpredictable demands. It is no wonder that most cities have gone bankrupt in the process and have little to show for the enormous expenditures that both public and private enterprise have made under an impossible division of the field. Have we the good sense as a nation to look behind the wreckage, and from its lessons derive new procedures for urban development in which we will assign to public enterprise the tasks that are public and to private enterprise those that are private, and let both do the jobs for which they are best fitted in the interest of the general good?

One answer to this question has recently been published over the names of an eminent committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce, whose authority to speak for private enterprise can scarcely be questioned. There is much that is sound and progressive in their analyses and recommendations, but the general tenor of their report fits into the old groove, with private enterprise given the initiative in city planning and development, and public enterprise left in the role of benevolent big brother to aid and abet the process. Entitled simply "Improvement of Housing in Cities," the report opens with fine disregard for its conclusions by showing what private enterprise has done to American cityhood in the past. Picking St. Louis as a typical example, it portrays the area of that city as five to ten per cent in need of total reconstruction, fifty to sixty per cent in need of rehabilitation, and the remainder good only if it can secure adequate public protection to keep it from following the older sections down the primrose path to slumdom. This frank appraisal of present-day conditions, with which I am sure we would all substantially agree, is followed by the interesting conclusion that the way to escape the current

situation is to follow the very course that led into it, and leave the regeneration of our cities in the hands of private enterprise, unshamed by the sight of public housing projects that have lately set new standards of urban decency.

Pondering the logic of that argument as I first read the report, I found myself reminded of an old refrain, and fancied that I saw, dimly as through a veil of soft coal smoke, old Dame City herself, crouched on her blighted areas and singing to the sweet memory of Private Enterprise the ditty that begins, "You made me what I am today, I hope you're satisfied!"

"You made me what I am today
I hope you're satisfied!
You dragged and dragged me down until
My soul within me died.

"You shattered each and every dream,
You fooled me from the start.
Altho you're not true, may God bless you,
That's the curse of an aching heart."

I would sing it to you, had I the permission of the copyright owners.

It seems strange that a group of eminent Americans, each of whom has had unusually rich experience with the forces that have built our cities, should ask us to turn back to the old processes of private enterprise for urban regeneration; to that same private enterprise that has built our slums, brought untimely blight upon our homes, created congestion in our streets and despoiled our countryside with surplus subdivisions! It is strange, and yet it is fairly typical of the wishful thinking in which we all indulge, thinking which has led us, with cities steadily becoming more and more of worse and worse about us, to hope that the way out of the difficulty might be some happy variant of the way in, and that the forces that year after year have relentlessly been making cities worse might somehow be depended on to make them better.

At the risk of being charged with high treason to the American Way, I make bold to assert that the way out is in fact the opposite of the way in. We will never have cities that are really fit to live in until we recognize that their formation is a public responsibility and not a private one, that the role of private enterprise must be at all times subservient to the general good of the community at large, and that the formulation of the general framework in which private effort fits is essentially a matter for public enterprise to tackle. We have not had effective city planning in the past because we have never actually admitted this prime prerequisite.

We have been prone to make the decisions which shape the destiny of cities on the basis of what were essentially private interests, often clothing them with a false glamor of presumed public good to salve our consciences.

Streets were widened because otherwise "the public" would be inconvenienced in reaching downtown shops. New arteries were opened to the suburbs in order that "the public" might enjoy the bright new subdivisions that awaited it there. Or according to the modern cry, the outward trend of population is to be discouraged and central areas rehabilitated, lest "the public," forsooth, lose the tax revenues based on the exploitation of central properties. "The public" has become a shibboleth to pass all sorts of plans, while the real good of the real public, the people who live and make their living in the cities, is forgotten. Instead of planning cities with the sole objective of producing a fitting environment for modern life and work, we have planned them to meet a hodgepodge of competing private interests, and then have perforce set up a few so-called city planning measures to ameliorate the worst abuses against the public weal. Even the name city planning has become associated with a set of stop-gap measures devised by a harassed public for its protection, rather than with a constructive procedure for bringing well planned cities into being. We never have, we never will, secure decent cities through that sort of city planning.

When, during the lush spring of 1929, Harold Battenheim spoke of the marriage of city planning and housing, he doubtless spoke in the vernacular of that day, of private housing occasionally perfumed with the public interest, of city planning redolent with private interests, and with an optimism invigorated by that hopeful event, the building of Radburn by a private corporation really devoted to the public good. In this harsher era of 1940, let us realistically consider what might result from a union of city planning and housing both thoroughly imbued with the public interest.

The Housing Authority of the capital of Georgia gives a cue in its recently issued report *Rebuilding Atlanta*. In text and illustration that report shows how the present and proposed housing projects in that city are beginning to transform the blighted areas into a series of attractive residential neighborhoods. If one's imagination is in good working order, he can picture the city actually rebuilt according to a modern pattern that recognizes the principle of residential cells, each planned as a neighborhood unit complete with its own school and shops and social facilities, and separated by the arteries that carry the lifeblood of traffic between them. With some extra oiling, the imagination may even carry this picture further, and envision outlying satellite communities built to a cellular pattern, fixed in general outlines by the public in the sole interest of a healthy and efficient community.

Free use of the imagination is very necessary in conjuring up this picture because neither in Atlanta nor in any other American city has such a wholesale rehabilitation actually taken place or been seriously projected. There is a great deal of progressive housing in evidence about the country but little evidence of progressive city planning to go with it. In fact, one cannot always be certain that the two have been on speaking terms of late.

To all appearances, housing has set forth rather vigorously on her new-found career and has not felt the companionship of city planning essential to her happiness.

I would not be so unchivalrous as to suggest that she should have waited for city planning to come along. Rather, I am inclined to place the blame on city planning for being left so far behind. What we have witnessed in the past few years is an acknowledgment of the public responsibility toward housing, without any similar recognition of the public responsibility toward city planning. And so we find in the more extensive housing projects, and in such prospectuses as the Atlanta report, a glimpse of what might be, rather than a sample of what ought to be, a glimpse of housing projects planned and built in the public interest but warped into cities whose form has been set by a collection of unguided and uncontrolled private interests often working at cross purposes. Only in the Greenbelt towns and a few special communities like Norris do we find both city planning and housing dominated by the public interest throughout a whole community.

Outside of these few communities I know of no case where a recent housing project, public or private, has been planned and built as a complete neighborhood unit, well organized internally and in its relationship to the surrounding city. Even in so pretentious a development as Parkchester, latest and justly famed pride of private enterprise, the careful internal planning of the project merely serves to heighten the contrast with its surroundings, and advertises to all and sundry that it is a misfit in the pattern of the New York metropolis. For private housing in that case ran up against the same snags that have beset public housing, the inability to carve out of an existing city a site wholly appropriate to the building of a new neighborhood. The fragments of old city that stick to Parkchester's gleaming sides like barnacles, the haphazard and wholly inadequate provision for the schooling and recreation of its residents, and the nonchalance of its setting in the city's transportation network, all give it the same stamp of imperfection that marks the recent large-scale projects in public housing. The experience of this multi-million dollar private venture merely bears out the experience of the multi-million dollar public program, that so long as diverse private interests control the basic plans of cities, the best of large-scale housing, under whatever auspices, must fall far short of accomplishing any real rehabilitation of the city structure.

The very great advances that have been made in housing, both public and private, during recent years stem from the new realization of public responsibility in that field. Whether public projects are built for those sectors of the population which private enterprise is unable to serve, or private projects are built for the higher income groups under the aid and stimulus of governmental programs, the recognition of the public interest is clear, and a sane and workable division of the field between public and private enterprise has resulted. We have but to go back a very few years

to see the contrast with the preceding era, when private enterprise ran the whole housing show, and house owners, the cities to whom they owed their taxes and the banks that loaned them money all went gloriously broke together.

I am not unmindful of the few exceptions that shone like beacons in that era, of Forest Hills Gardens, Radburn, Chatham Village and other private ventures which served to point the way. Nor am I unmindful of the previous era of public housing during World War I, when some of our best early examples of well planned projects were constructed. The present era could not have come about without those pioneerings, but it is a new era because as a nation we have finally come to insist that those pioneers be followed, and that housing henceforth take its cue from their example rather than from the great mass of bad housing that was typical of their time.

In city planning, as in housing, the time for the new era has arrived. Here, too, some of the most valued pioneering has been done by private enterprise. The garden cities of England, the finest examples yet produced of towns built to a soundly conceived basic pattern, were planned and built by private interests, as was our own trail blazer on this side of the Atlantic, the town of Radburn. In these communities, sites were selected, the size and form of the community determined, and the basic plans prepared solely in the public interest, thus setting an example for public enterprise to follow. In the garden cities, the proper role of private enterprise was also demonstrated in the planning and construction of various properties within the general framework established for the town.

No better proof of the basic public interest in the forms of cities could be found than that which now comes to us from Europe. Perhaps the booming of cannon will prove more persuasive than the booming of real estate, the new threat of destruction from without may be more persuasive than the old evidence of disintegration from within. The sheer vulnerability of great cities may force us as a matter of public policy to decentralize into communities of less tempting bulk. Concentrations of manufactures may have to be dispersed into areas harder for bombers and artillery to find. When we are faced with the threat of invasion we can see that the location of cities within our borders, their size and their internal structure are all matters of vital national concern. Would that we could have seen that fact as well without the threat of war to clear our lazy vision.

It is sad comfort that a low building density which decreases the chances of being hit by bombs also provides open spaces for sunlight and for play. The parks and gardens that give our buildings a four to one chance of escaping demolition, likewise increase our chances of survival under the more normal processes of city life. If we are forced to build fire-resisting houses, arranged in neighborhood cells with belts of open space between, in order to parry the threat of conflagration, may there be some

comfort in the thought that the same device will promote a better organization of peace-time city life. And if perchance the very horror of the thought of New York, Chicago or San Francisco subjected to a rain of shells impels us to a redistribution of these overgrown metropolises on some saner pattern, let not the tears that we may shed over the loss of long cherished bigness wholly blot our vision to the fact that war will thus have served at least one constructive purpose.

Whether our cities are in fact faced with the unaccustomed blight of war or the customary blights of peace, we can no longer overlook the fact that their future is the public's business. Two-thirds of our people live in them, most of our industrial production takes place in them, the minds and the materials of the nation are formed in them. It is a risk no modern nation can afford to take to leave the determination of its urban structure to the hit-or-miss processes of individual enterprise. Let's freely admit that we do not at the moment have the governmental machinery to meet this challenge. We do not have machinery at the federal level which can guide the location of industrial centers in the national interest. We do not have machinery at the state level that can guide the urban patterning of the states. We do not even have machinery at the urban level adequately to direct and control the development of individual communities.

Not so very long ago we were woefully deficient in the machinery of military preparation, but we are now embarked on a most extensive program for securing it and putting it to work. The machinery of government is not fabricated quite as easily as the machinery of industrial production, but its creation is not a hopeless task. There was little governmental machinery for tackling the housing problem seven years ago. There is a great deal today, and while there is still some healthy controversy about its proper functioning, the same might be said of radio or television. If there is such a thing as an American Way, it is epitomized in our ability to devise the machinery we need to meet our problems, and that is as true of the machinery of government as it is of the machinery of private endeavor.

Suppose that it should cost twenty billion dollars to provide public housing for the families that need it, as our Chamber of Commerce committee estimates with such obvious alarm? What if it should cost a hundred billions more of private funds to complete the process and really put the nation's cities on a modern footing? What young person would not mortgage his future for a decent home? This is still a young nation and can easily afford whatever mortgaging of our public and private futures may be needed to secure a decent environment for living. Personally, being neither a banker nor an economist, I think all this grave talk about mortgaging our future to pay for housing and urban rehabilitation is pure bunk. The money will be spent in any case, whether we build well or poorly. The only thing that need concern us is that we get our money's

worth. We never have, and the country still manages to get along. How much better a country it could be if we spent our money wisely!

So to conclude on the note with which we started, let me engage in some speculation about the union of housing and city planning. I suspect that housing has gone out into the world, acquired an education and generally improved herself since Harold Battenheim found her in the embrace of city planning eleven years ago. My advice to the young man is, in case you see him anywhere about these corridors, go out and do likewise. Make yourself worthy of the young lady's continuing affection, and you may find her ready to blend her career with yours. And don't be sparing with the children.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

REPORTER: John G. Marr, *City Planning Engineer, Oakland.*

DISCUSSION LEADERS: Catherine Bauer, *Department of Social Welfare, University of California.*

Winters Haydock, *Director, Region VII, United States Housing Authority.*

Eugene H. Klaber, *Assistant Director, Low-Cost Housing Administration, Federal Housing Administration.*

Mr. Klaber, in his discussion of Mr. Augur's paper, mentioned the opportunities for sound planning that San Francisco enjoyed after the fire in the early 1900's. With plans completed, however, the rebuilding proceeded with almost complete disregard for the planned development. This has been ascribed to the difficulties of overcoming the opposition of vested interests to a rational scheme of development which trod on the toes of private ownership of property. To quote Mr. Klaber: "As long as vested rights of ownership in land persist in their present form, our city planning efforts will run into difficulties. And if private enterprise is to persist in its present attitude, there is only one alternative—and that is public ownership."

Mr. Alfred Bettman, Chairman of the Cincinnati City Planning Commission, directed the attention of the meeting to the difficulties which have arisen in Russia where the problem of private ownership of land has been tackled. The elimination of private ownership there has not proved a cure-all. All land belongs to the state, but when the commissioners of industry and housing, for instance, decide that an identical area is particularly suited for the use of each, there immediately arise complications of a magnitude equal to those incident to private ownership of land.

Mr. Charles M. Weber, a member of the California State Legislature, stated, "Difficulties will continue as long as individuals love the value of land more than the use of land. . . . I do not think a revolution will occur which will change the concept of private ownership of land. How

can we achieve the objective which we all believe desirable? It is necessary that we have complete cooperation among federal, state and local governmental agencies acting with private industry. Bureaucratic stagnation must be avoided."

Mr. Weber went on to say that housing is or should be an integral part of city planning. The instruments for good planning are available within the present legislative acts in California and full advantage should be taken of them immediately to insure the preparation and application of master plans.

Jacob Crane, Assistant Administrator of the United States Housing Authority, whose remarks were read by Winters Haydock, stated that the United States Housing Authority is making every effort to place public housing programs on as firm a base of sound city planning as is possible. Mr. Crane said, "Public housing agencies are drawing in full upon the available city planning facilities. The main difficulty is that these facilities are in many cases elementary or even non-existent. USHA is interested in any feasible means to strengthen this relationship."

Miss Catherine Bauer stated that many of the difficulties of the USHA public housing program have come not from the sources from which they had been expected, i.e., economic, social and political problems, but from the technical problems of site selection. Many planning commissions are in no position to judge the adequacy of a particular site for housing use. The failure in many instances to present other than a purely theoretical analysis has led to innumerable difficulties. Miss Bauer discussed many of the relative advantages and disadvantages of vacant and clearance sites as discovered through the experience of the United States Housing Authority. She stated that a realistic approach which takes account of technical, political, psychological and emotional factors is necessary in site selection. The slum, blighted area and vacant land site must each be considered. The final determination of a site, to be successful, must represent a synthesis of all of the various considerations.

Miss Bauer stated that in California much thought must be given to the application of police power in the elimination and prevention of unsatisfactory housing.

She stated that the planners can expect increased controversy as their master plans become more advanced and as specific programs are prepared for implementing those plans. Miss Bauer felt that housing is one aspect of planning but that it has advanced much farther than has planning. It is possible that planning may anticipate some of the difficulties now attendant upon public housing.

Myron D. Downs, engineer-secretary of the Cincinnati City Planning Commission, stated that there are two predominant needs in planning for successful housing. In the first place, a realistic approach is required to the problem of density of population in city housing projects and an adjustment between land values and land uses. The second point raised by

Mr. Downs was that uncontrolled development in rural areas in the vicinity of metropolitan districts should be controlled by the adoption of building codes to insure a reasonable standard of improvement. Miss Bauer posed the question as to how such building codes could be applied, particularly in rural California where the average family income approximates \$500 a year. The simplest housing, adjusted to such an income, would not produce decent buildings, and if the code were applied no building would take place.

Mr. M. Tellefson, city attorney of Culver City, California, described a section of the building code of that city controlling the character of improvements by having all structures which are of unusual shape or material or which might affect the surrounding development referred to the City Planning Commission for special study before any building permit is issued.

Mr. Joshua H. Vogel, the planning engineer of King County Planning Commission, Washington, discussed the provisions made for housing of all types in the master plan of King County, involving possibilities for co-operation with USHA, FHA, FSA and other governmental agencies.

Planning in a Democracy

CHARLES E. MERRIAM

Vice-Chairman, National Resources Planning Board

It is sometimes maintained that planning cannot be conducted in a democratic form of society but must be confined to totalitarian systems, to autocratic authorities, using widespread violence or the threat of violence.

Before considering the question of democracy in planning, it is important to reconsider what the nature of democracy is, and then what planning is; and then the relation of democracy to planning.

I. WHAT IS DEMOCRACY?

There is nothing new in the statement that democracy is under fire. It always has been. For a few years after the World War the attacks upon democratic organization died down and perhaps seemed to some ended, but this was only an intermission—a lull in the storm.

For centuries there have been two opposing assumptions about control in political society: (1) that the control of the common affairs of the community belongs in the few; and (2) that the control of the common affairs of the community belongs in the many.

The problem of the few has been: (1) to find the superior, (2) to continue the line, (3) to insure their regard for and judgment of the common good, and (4) to bring about mass confidence in their intentions and actions. Mirage, rainbow, illusion, are written on this record.

The alternative is the government of common affairs by the community.

The old charges against democracy may be summed up as follows: (1) It is adapted only to a very small state—a city state—the hillsides of Switzerland. (2) It must be the rule of the ignorant herd. (3) It must be a weak government incapable by its very nature of military survival.

Democracy has been attacked in recent years from the right and the left for diametrically opposite reasons. Marxians have held that democracy is the necessary and inevitable tool of capitalism, while on the other hand, right wingers have held that democracy is the handy tool of socialistic trends and purposes. So the revolutionary wing of the Marxians attacked democracy by Bolshevism, although the social democracy went along with democracy. In Italy and in Germany Fascism and Naziism were conjured up as saviors of the world from communism. These rapid fadeouts and closeups may be a little confusing, but if you look at them carefully with a slowed down reel, the confusion disappears. For Democracy ap-

pears as a symbol for something that stands in the way of impatience for results, right or left wing.

In the newest invasion of our western democracies, violence is glorified and the virtues of reasonable discussion decried. The language and the tone is that of frustration, hate, ruthlessness. They shout indeed, rather than speak. The lack of a carefully thought out anti-democratic theory, however diligent the search, suggests that the basis of the anti-democratic view is found in the desire to set up a propaganda defense of militarism and national expansion.

If you look for serious and well-considered critiques of democracy, the best are made by democrats themselves, who alone can speak freely of their faults.

What are the assumptions of democracy?

1. The dignity of man and the importance of treating personalities upon a fraternal rather than a differential basis.
2. The perfectibility of man—the confidence in developing more fully the possibilities latent in human personalities—as against caste, class and slave systems.
3. The gains of civilization and of nations are essentially mass gains, the product of national effort—in war and in peace.
4. Confidence in the consent of the governed, expressed in institutional forms, understandings and practices as the basis of authority.
5. The value of decisions arrived at by rational processes, by common counsel, with the implications of tolerance and freedom of discussion, rather than violence and brutality, normally.

The implements of democracy are the suffrage, the deliberative council, the apparatus of civil liberties, and finally sound administrative organization and systems of adjudication.

Much confusion has been caused by the entangling of democracy with economic systems or with areas or units of government. Democracy is a form of political association, not identified with any special form of economic organization, or with any special unit of aggregation, such as the city-state, the national-state or the world-state or the class-state.

Democracy is a form of political association which disappears from time to time but does not die. It is a continuing type of political association which has its roots in the community whose common affairs are decided by the community. This then is a basic principle of association, and in the long run, whatever may happen in the meantime, this principle will go on. The common good will be determined by the community.

Even those who are now heckling democracy cannot escape its implications. Why do they not abolish the vote? Why do they not abolish the forms of representation and consultation? Why do they profess their own superior capacity to reflect the people's will and interest? Hitler speaks of a "true Germanic democracy"; Mussolini demands an "Italian proletarian democracy"; the soviets refer to a "socialistic democracy."

And this is done because the symbolisms of democracy, the attitudes of popular rule, the demands of popular welfare, are so deeply ingrained in the modern mind that they cannot safely be challenged, even by those who seem to hold in their hands autocratic power. In the end the commonwealth will be what the community wants, expressed in such forms and institutions as the community chooses and supports.

Some basic considerations must be examined before going farther. The most revolutionary factor in modern life is not Nazism or Fascism. It is the unparalleled growth of human reason, science, invention, technology. The National Resources Planning Board, in its elaborate report on research as a national resource, showed that in the United States alone there were 1,300,000 patents for inventions in the first third of this century and there will be more in the next third. What does this mean?

1. Inventions in transportation and communication have upset the political boundaries of the whole world, dwarfing them out of all proportion and compelling basically new adjustments.

2. Increase of productivity has revolutionized the world by making a transition from an economy of scarcity to an economy of abundance, and necessitating reconsideration of traditional practices.

The whole struggle over democracy is utterly blind without taking these factors into account, and without reckoning on the entrance of democracy into this new New World.

The age old struggle between the many and the few is now cast upon another and a different stage. Whatever happens, new means are emerging for the attainment of the old ends, whether democratic or autocratic.

The old assumptions of democracy are still good, but its programs and practices must be adapted to a new world; and the same is true of the assumptions of aristocracy and autocracy. We are not going backward, but forward. Security, justice, liberty are on their way, and will not be blocked by gorillas, grafters, and incompetents.

What shall we do with our vast machinery of production? How shall we spell out the meaning of democracy in the daily lives of men and women? Are war and unemployment the only alternatives? What shall we do with world order? Are we prepared to consider not only the ends of democracy but also its means at any given time, and to adjust accordingly? Democracy must have not merely a past, but a future; not merely traditions, but inventions.

In a transition period, there is much intellectual confusion.

1. *Dictators.* The so-called dictators of the modern day are not dictators at all, but are despots or autocrats. They do not even call themselves dictators, but Duce and Fuehrer. Dictatorship is a historical democratic device. In the days of the Roman Republic a dictator was appointed for a short and specific time to save the state. At the end of the time he returned to his plow or wherever he was before. The present day autocrat,

on the other hand, did not obtain this power from the people, nor does he intend to return it at any time.

Daladier had dictatorial powers but was removed from office in the middle of his career. Chamberlain had broad powers but left office even when he had a majority of eighty, because of public criticism. Clemenceau never attained the presidency of France. Lloyd George became a voice crying in the wilderness.

No real student of democracy ever maintained that a democracy could not defend itself in a moment of crisis. The real question is, are the emergency powers to be returned. Is there a working mechanism for that purpose, and a working general understanding?

2. *Decisionism*. The charge that democracy is incapable of decisionism and decisiveness is a favorite assertion of its critics, and this is sometimes conceded unnecessarily by its friends. Democracy can neither conduct a war, it is charged, nor organize internal social programs adapted to our time.

That democracy cannot make the preparations or decisions incidental to war is not sustained by cold historic facts. The British navy has been traditionally powerful; the French army a great war machine; the American army in 1865 was the most powerful in the world. And our air force will be, I predict. The mechanized force of present-day Germany is not a thing that a democracy could not have constructed, had it wished for war and paid the price in national standards of living. The present gorilla warfare came on because the gentleman with the umbrella thought he was dealing with likeminded gentlemen.

Where the parliamentary chamber is silent there is always an ante-chamber where discussion, conflict and intrigue have their way. Often there is discord and delay. Our debates are in the open, but if we knew what went on behind the scenes of autocracy, we might be amused. There is plenty of history to illustrate this since the days when the Roman emperor made one of his horses a knight.

There is no guaranty even that an autocrat will be decisive unless he has that kind of mind. He may be a moron or indecisive in his very nature. The effective basis of decisionism in any government is not arbitrariness, but rests on cooperation soundly organized for action.

3. *Inefficiency*. It is said at times, "Of course it must be admitted that democracies are not and cannot be as well organized or as efficient as autocracies."

The laboratory of history furnishes many illustrations of inefficient democracies and also of inefficient non-democracies. There is nothing in the science of management to indicate that a democratic board of directors responsible to a body of owners cannot set up a form of policy determination and forms of administration which will work effectively in a wide variety of situations, normal and crises. The growth of the art and science of

public administration in modern times makes it more feasible than before to organize control in last analysis and working management. Modern democracy has opened administration to democracy, instead of restricting it to a class.

Underneath all the controversy of parties, factions and even of forms of government, an observer cannot escape seeing the immense advances of scientific, expert administrative service. This does not mean that all government will land in the hands of experts, but that the administration of plans predetermined by the community will rest in the hands of expert, technical, competent public servants. This is one of the great guaranties of human progress in governmental affairs, and especially of democracy.

On the policy-forming side, democracy makes possible the higher development of morale—an intangible factor that often wins wars and enlarges productive capacity in peace. A democratic government may be as weak or as strong as the emergency or the temper and custom of the people desire and demand.

4. *Violence.* There are those who strike from their lexicon the word "violence." They find refuge and solace in the Oxford oath—that was before the bombings began.

We must concern ourselves with force in order that we may be able to reason, in order that we may carry on the pursuits in which we wish to engage. We must set up a world in which the values we cherish may live and grow and come to their special forms of perfection.

What we call "violence" is an inferior form of organization itself. It is the task of reason to examine this organization, to understand it, to invent forms of reorganization which are superior in type and which may come into general acceptance as we go along. Violence is really the inferior organization of vital life forces. We do not seek to abolish these energies: we aim at their reasonable control.

The difficulty is not with the high explosive but with the purposes to which it is devoted in a given situation. The organization of violence is a technical question, to answer which men of reason will be called. There is no reason why bandits and gangsters should be given the secrets of the laboratory, of management, of psychology, of medicine, for their purposes alone.

Reason must yield to force, some say, in this era of open assertion that might makes right, within the state and without. No, the answer is that reason itself is the greatest force, and in the end it will prevail. The great work of politics is to promote the commonwealth as seen by reason and applied by reasonable measures through reasonable men. But reason must be allied with will, with faith, with hope, with practical judgment, and must be set as the jewel in organization and management. It is one of the very greatest tasks of politics, now and always, to bring about the fusion of these factors—their union and their expression—in the richest forms of social and political life.

II. WHAT IS PLANNING?

Planning is an organized effort to utilize social intelligence in the determination of natural policies. Planning is based upon fundamental facts regarding resources, carefully assembled and thoroughly analyzed; upon a look around at the various factors which must be brought together in order to avoid clashing of policies or lack of unity in general direction; upon a look forward as well as a look around and a look backward. Considering our resources and trends as carefully as possible, and considering the emerging problems, planners look forward to the determination of long-time policies.

Many of these plans will be imperfect. Some will be mistaken. But taken in its entirety, all planning effort amounts to an intelligent forecast of the nation's future, as carefully prepared as is possible from the technical side, and as prudently as possible from the point of view of community determination of community policies, local, state and national.

From the beginning of our national life various forms of planning have been in evidence. The industrial situation confronting the founders of this republic was one of widespread distress, insecurity, and depression of the most anxious type. They deliberately planned a way out. The constitution itself was an economic-political plan on a grand scale, not only providing a democratic frame of government, but also setting up special plans for dealing with currency, tariffs, interstate commerce, and international relations. Justice was the first term in the preamble and liberty the last, but between them came the general welfare, common defense and domestic tranquillity. The constitutional convention itself was a large-scale planning board.

Alexander Hamilton's well-known *Report on Manufactures* presented in 1791 was an impressive consideration of national policy in industry and related fields of American interest. In broad terms Alexander Hamilton set out the national problems of economics and government and suggested specific lines of policy to be followed. The report on internal improvements drawn up by President Jefferson's Secretary of the Treasury, Albert Gallatin, was almost equally notable. Henry Clay developed later (1820) the famous "American system," in which tariff and internal improvements occupied a conspicuous place. It is clear that the encouragement of manufactures by a policy of protection began as a systematic planning procedure, though later it degenerated at times into a free-for-all scramble for favors.

The land policy of the United States was planned with similar deliberation. It began with the abolition of the system of primogeniture and entail, the basis of the British system of political and economic power. The "grand plan" of John Quincy Adams for the management of the national domain was not followed; but the later development of the

American homestead policy (1862) was designed to give a homestead at a nominal cost to practically all prospective settlers.

Our public educational policy rested in large part upon the broad grants of public lands given—two sections per township—for school purposes, with additional amounts for land-grant colleges. All this was notable national planning as of that day and age, democratic in purpose and method and highly successful in producing results. Those who prefer not to call this planning may, of course, apply some other term, but that will not change the spirit and temper of the work of the first great national planners who laid broad foundations for the republic of their dreams.

Down to the Civil War, no country in the world had made bolder and more successful experiments in the field of government and economics alike than the United States.

Following that war, planning centered for several decades in large-scale private industries, such as had scarcely been known theretofore. Giant enterprises began to dominate whole areas of industry, and to operate them in increasingly unified and systematic fashion, although not always in the public interest. But national planning did not cease. It was resorted to whenever the public came to believe that unrestricted business enterprise failed at some point to promote the national welfare. Examples of government intervention designed to protect public interests are the establishment of the Inter-State Commerce Commission in 1887, and the passage of the Sherman Antitrust Act in 1890, the organization of the Federal Trade Commission, and a long series of national and state measures having the same general purpose.

A less controversial step toward national planning was the development of the conservation program designed for the protection of natural resources under the leadership of Theodore Roosevelt. This wide-ranging movement, based upon study of prevailing trends, constituted a striking example of intelligent and forward-looking national policy, designed to protect and promote our common interests through various types of controls preventive of wasteful exploitation of our basic resources. In addition to the plans of the United States Government, similar systems and arrangements were set up by several of the states in various fields.

A more dramatic development of national planning was the "economic mobilization" developed during the World War through the War Industries Board, the War Trade Board, the Shipping Board, the War Labor Board, the Food Administration, the Fuel Administration, and the Railroad Administration, with their various subsidiaries. Under the stimulus of the war objective and national unity of purpose, far-reaching plans were made for the utilization of resources, for the ordering of industry, and for the focusing of the nation's strength in military and naval pressure. Nor did plans for economic mobilization end with the war. The National Defense Act of 1921 is a plan for a national war emergency—a plan which

covers the wide ranges of industrial life necessarily reorganized for war purposes.

Though the war-time controls were released promptly after the armistice, the speculative boom of 1919-20 and the severe though brief depression of 1920-21 brought home to everyone the fact that peace hath her defeats no less than war. The elaborate report on *Waste in Industry*, sponsored by the American Engineering Council in 1921, was a landmark in a movement toward better economic management, and this line was followed by important developments of planning in the Department of Commerce. By improving methods of management and extending markets, it was hoped to increase profits and thus enable business to give full employment and pay high wages, while turning out an ever larger volume of consumers' goods—a policy that was thought for a while to promise the gradual abolition of poverty. Trade associations began their rapid growth under the benevolent auspices of the United States Government. Attacks upon waste, demands for standardization, simplification, research in production efficiency, long-time plans for stabilization and equilibrium in industry, were pressed forward.

Another notable development was the reorganization of the budgetary procedure of the United States Government through the Budget Bureau and the Director of the Budget—a reform long advocated and finally accomplished—under President Harding. While many of these powers were already in the hands of the president, the deliberate planning of ways and means for the exercise of his authority unquestionably had an important influence in the direction of systematic scrutiny and control over public expenditures.

The organization of the Federal Employment Stabilization Board through the efforts of Senator Wagner and President Hoover was an attempt to plan expenditures for public works over a period of years in relation to business cycles. The six-year programs of public works collected by this board from many government bureaus made it possible for the Public Works Administration in 1933 to put out a billion dollars of federal construction within a few months far more promptly than they could bring a large volume of non-federal undertakings to that stage.

Since that time many forms of planning have appeared. City planning agencies have sprung up, reaching now the number of some one thousand. County planning boards have been established covering a quarter of our three thousand counties. Some forty-five state planning agencies have been established. Regional planning committees have been set up and commissions on interstate cooperation have been organized by most of the states. Many large-scale efforts in the field of planning have been developed by the United States Government in the last ten years, beginning with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the Federal Employment Stabilization Office under President Hoover, and followed by notable examples under President

Roosevelt. No effort is made here to sum up all of the attempts made in this direction. They include planning in agriculture, in labor, in industry, in the Tennessee Valley Authority, in public works, in land, water and mineral use, for social security, for education, for scientific research, for city, county, state, region and nation.

The National Resources Planning Board, created by President Roosevelt in 1933, was substantially the projection of the Advisory Council, proposed by President Hoover's Committee on Recent Social Trends in 1933. This body has made fundamental studies and contributions to intelligent national policy in relation to land use, water use, mineral and energy uses; by fine programming of public works; scientific studies of population trends, of the social effects of inventions, of research as an actual resource; of regions and cities; reports upon the structure of our national economy, of consumer expenditures and consumer income.

Progress of planning in recent years has naturally followed the lines previously indicated in agriculture, industry, public works, etc. Perhaps the most notable advances in the planning movement have been made in the agricultural field with the organization of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, and later through the reorganization of the department's planning for the development of our agricultural resources which has been pushed ahead through democratic procedures with state agricultural advisory councils and county agricultural planning agencies. There are now many county agricultural councils where, under the leadership of the county extension agent, farmers and representatives of bureaus of the agriculture department get together for determination of land-use policies. Through the cooperation of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture in the Land Committee of the National Resources Planning Board major investigations of problem areas and policy problems have been initiated with joint field action in the Northern Great Plains, the Pacific Northwest, the backwater areas of the Mississippi, and the Northern Great Lakes area, and on such policy problems as tax delinquency, public land acquisition, land classification, etc.

Experience and the great wealth of information developed by the research staff of the National Recovery Administration have laid a foundation for further advances in industrial planning; and economic studies through the Temporary National Economic Committee and the National Resources Planning Board have furthered planning with them for industry. The availability of unemployed workers for fact-gathering has made possible the studies of consumer income and expenditures through the joint efforts of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bureau of Home Economics, the National Resources Committee and the Works Progress Administration. Through the Industrial Committee of the Board, techniques have been explored for measurement of productive capacity, and a major report prepared upon the structure of the American economy.

Public works are a tool for national development as well as for con-

ervation of resources, and, to provide employment, have of course been enormously expanded in recent years. Planning techniques and the possibilities of programming in accordance with the general theory of the Federal Employment Stabilization Act have been and are still being developed.

In recent years our human resources have received greater emphasis than ever before which has led to a planned approach to problems of old-age pension, unemployment insurance, relief policies, social security.

Notwithstanding differences of judgment regarding either the policy or the administration of these undertakings, there is general agreement that many of them have been highly successful, and taken together they illustrate the importance of planning our fundamental national policy in the emergency period upon which we are now entering. Doubtless many other evidences of national planning of resources both natural and human will be seen. It becomes more and more evident that the fullest use of American national resources cannot be obtained without careful and intelligent planning—national, state, regional, and local.

III. DEMOCRATIC PLANNING

Much of the criticism of democratic planning is made by those who have not clearly understood either "democracy" or "planning." Of course, if we assume that the community does not know and cannot know what it wants, and if we assume that drifting is better than planning, we will not want either democracy or planning, much less the two in combination. When the nature of the democratic political society is thoroughly understood and when the nature of planning is carefully considered, it becomes evident not only that planning is possible in a democracy, but that the soundest form of planning will be found in the soundest democracy.

Two traps are set here for boobies. Trap one, that all must be planned. Trap two, that nothing can be planned. There are those who contend somewhat noisily at times that no substantial advance can be made toward the readjustment of our internal social problems unless all is planned in totalitarian style, and that by violence and revolution. Progress through catastrophe we call this doctrine. It is proclaimed alike by the left wing of the socialistic movement and by the new autocrats. Nothing but a series of surgical operations can save the patient, they seem to say. Or in the old biblical language, "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins." Even Professor Laski seems to hold that democracies cannot reorganize their affairs without a strong purge by the salts of revolution.

On the other hand, there are those who cling to the conviction that all or most governmental "intervention" or "regulation" or "control" or "guidance" is either superfluous or dangerous. Otherwise sane men declare that every tax dollar is lost even if spent for schools or fire depart-

ments, or all government is smeared as bureaucracy, or all planning by the same logic is unwise and even subversive—perhaps not city planning or county planning. But in general all government planning is suspect. All this reckons without the complexities of modern life and the swift pace of mechanized industry.

We can plan for peace as well as for war. We can solve the basic problem of national production, the problem of unemployment, the problems of social security, if we have the will and vision to make a common effort worthy of the emergency in which we find ourselves. Our economy is not a closed one. We can make our seventy billion income eighty billions and from that go on to one hundred or whatever the optimum figure may be. And within the framework of free industry and free government. We can make sure that our national gains are democratically applied.

This will involve planning, as will our whole world situation, but planning within the boundaries of free society, industrial and political. The unplanned society in our day will not survive the competition of our time. Some seem to forget that we can plan to be free as well as plan to be unfree. Planning nothing is the direct road to planning everything.

The basis of planning is not autocracy, totalitarianism, or violence, but is intelligent cooperation. The common good is best promoted when the community has something to say about it, when the community has power to determine what is the general good and how that shall be discussed, decided, and administered. Planning involves the exercise of foresight, it involves cooperation, it involves a general understanding of long-time policy and a general determination to advance the common good as understood by the bulk of the community. Planning is not helped by becoming totalitarian, but hindered.

The common good does not call for complete uniformity in conduct but requires variation in things that are not common. Effectiveness is determined not merely by the complete concentration of the power to decide, but also by that general good will and cooperativeness without which wise decisions cannot be made, or, if made, cannot be carried out. It is true that in a moment of great crisis—as in pestilence, war, famine, flood, fire—unity is important. To some this unity may seem important not only for a crisis but as a continuous practice. In reality, however, concentration in an emergency rests upon the assumption of long-time cooperation. The old-time dictators “cashed in,” so to speak, on habits of cooperation in the state. But cooperation is soon exhausted unless it is renewed and revived by participation of the community in the consideration of questions of the common good. Everyone may subordinate his will for a while in putting out a fire and in rescuing persons and property threatened by flood, but when it comes to an extensive program of fire and flood prevention, the habits, customs and will of the large number of people must be taken into consideration and with the greatest care. Wide ranges of peoples and

wide varieties of personal interests and choices are involved, and must be the basis of any plan.

America is committed to the propositions (1) that the best government is found where the bulk of the community determines the broad lines of community policy, and (2) that community policies are better determined by rational consideration, deliberation and cooperation than by violence and terror.

Despotisms old and new, in many periods of the world's history, have built great monuments flattering to their pride—great pyramids, great boulevards, great empires—and some of these monuments, built as they were upon cruelty, blood, hate, and scorn of the humble man stood for centuries, and indeed will stand like the pyramids. These despotisms were not concerned, however, with the elevation of all men, with the fair distribution of the gains of the community, with raising the standards of human living—material, intellectual or spiritual, with the emancipation of the slave or the serf, or with the unfolding of the possibilities hidden in the human personality.

Our democratic planning is aimed at the highest possible standards of national production constantly expanded through the years, and at the translation of national production into the lives of the mass of our citizens. We plan not for the glory of the conquerors or the gratification of national hatred or national pride, but for ennobling and enriching the existence of our citizens and of mankind.

We stand at the gates of the age of plenty, key in hand, fumbling at the lock. Make no mistake, we face a new era. We are not going back, but forward, to build in the New World a new and finer form of American democratic state, a loftier realm to which human personality may wing its way and find its home.

For my part, I hold that America will come triumphant through this the greatest ordeal of modern times—triumphant not merely in a material or in a military sense, but triumphant in the higher and finer values where life really dwells in its fullness.

America will take its place and assume its share of responsibility in shaping and maintaining a jural order of the world, in lifting human relations to new levels of order and justice. "Am I my brother's keeper" is a phrase that has echoed and re-echoed in human history as a justification for selfish gain, but there is a higher ideal expressed in the loftier words, "No man liveth unto himself alone."

America will work out a program, built upon national unity, which will raise the volume of national production and at the same time raise the standards of living in accordance with the principles of social justice. Our vast national resources, our dynamic energy, our inventiveness and resourcefulness, our organizing ability, our huge economy with its rich powers of expansion, make this a possibility. But this is not the task of soft hearts and heads alone, but of hard heads and tough temper. Amer-

ica will maintain its free society, industrial and political, streamlined to meet the changing conditions of modern life.

If we are prepared in America, then those of feeble faith and weakening will and fumbling judgment can be disregarded. Those will carry forward the torch of democratic ideals whose stout hearts are unterrified and unintimidated by threats, scowls and blows. Men with clear eyes can discern and point out the sounder courses, and America can advance to the destiny that spreads before a people with the richest possibilities ever within the grasp of man.

But all this cannot and will not come to pass without much searching of mind, heart and soul in readiness for one of the greatest tests in recorded time.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

REPORTER: James C. Rettie, *Senior Planning Technician, Region IX, National Resources Planning Board.*

DISCUSSION LEADERS: Earle S. Draper, *Assistant Administrator, Federal Housing Administration.*

Rexford G. Tugwell, *Chairman, New York City Planning Commission.*

In discussing Dr. Merriam's paper Mr. Draper expressed general agreement. He went on, however, to develop the idea that planning even at the "grass-roots" is a procedure which may be more or less independent of the trend of public opinion. Planning involves the application of scientific analysis and the results of these analyses then become the stuff out of which rational political forms might emerge. Whether public opinion shall accept the findings of the technical planners depends in part upon the validity of the conclusions which the planners may reach, and if these conclusions be unsound the good sense of the country can probably be depended upon to reject them. Planning in a democracy, Mr. Draper believes, does not necessarily imply that the people as a whole must make the plans. We may need still more delegation of authority in the making of plans and presenting of programs and no great risk will be involved as long as the final decision rests with the majority.

Your reporter is not at all certain that he understood Dr. Tugwell's remarks well enough to be able to interpret his comments on Dr. Merriam's paper. He drew a contrast between "democratic planning" and "planning in a democracy." Democratic planning, to the mind of Dr. Tugwell, is a contradiction of terms, because, if truly democratic, this form of planning could be nothing better than political discussion. Planning in a democracy, like planning in any other realm, involves technical investigations which the common citizen will not be able to perform. Later the citizen

will, of course, be called upon to determine general policy on the basis of facts disclosed by the process of scientific investigation.

Dr. Tugwell also challenged Dr. Merriam's implied assumption that we have in our society what might be termed democracy. He, therefore, questioned the relevance of a planning procedure designed especially for the type of political society which modern America does not at the moment possess. Your reporter feels that Dr. Tugwell's idea deserved much more adequate development than was possible in this conference session. If, for example, the economic institutions of our society, as seems apparent to many, already constitute a neo-feudalism in which the authority of the democratic state is challenged by various private economic empires, the planning procedure appropriate for democracy may not be applicable at all. It may, in fact, be completely impotent, simply because it is designed for the political and economic democracy which has already ceased to exist. The late James Harvey Rogers once said that any economic system which could no longer provide reasonable economic security for most of the people most of the time would inevitably be displaced, if not by a better, at least by a different, system.

Dr. Merriam rightly pointed out that democracy is not inevitably associated with the economic system called capitalism, but it is probably equally true to say that any economic system at present associated with democracy which fails to provide for basic security will be pretty certain to go under, and in that process it is very likely to pull democracy with it. This, to my understanding, is the main point upon which Dr. Tugwell insisted.

San Francisco as Seen from New York

REXFORD G. TUGWELL

Chairman, New York City Planning Commission

This is a rather difficult situation for me. I was asked to talk rather simply before the Down Town Association about the experience of the city by which I am employed, and I find in the audience not only the Governor of the State, but all three members of the National Resources Planning Board, not to mention many distinguished planners in other fields. That leaves me at a loss to know exactly to whom I should talk. I am going to assume, however, that the members of the National Resources Planning Board and the Governor have to take the consequences, and that the merchants and I are going to consider something which is not at all noble, is a little dry and dusty, but nevertheless, to the merchants and to myself, a matter of considerable importance. So I hope I may be forgiven if I don't seem to amuse those of you who are neither interested in city planning nor particularly, perhaps, in these days, in the city itself. I can understand very well why you might not be, with all that is going on in the world.

The city, important as it is in our daily lives, is something which we usually take for granted. It is not an exciting thing often, except when a reform movement is on. At other times we are apt to assume that it will more or less manage itself. All the experience I have had in government, not only in city government but in others, has led me to believe that it is a fiction that there can be a government of laws and not of men, and, so far as planning is concerned, I am thoroughly convinced that planning is an activity which cannot be set up and left to itself; it is fallacious to assume that if there is planning in a city it doesn't matter what kind of administrators there are. A government is only as good as the people who are running the government. That is true not only of federal and state government, but of city government.

Let me say at the outset that I have not come to San Francisco to tell you anything about San Francisco itself, nor about what your possibilities are. I have come merely to tell you something about the experiences we have had in New York in doing somewhat the same things that I judge you may be thinking of doing. Certainly there are a great many similarities: we are both great seaport towns, great centers of commerce; we both have rather regional than strictly municipal problems; we both have been planned badly in the past; we both have decaying centers and growing peripheries; we both are centers of management of large enterprises, financial, educational and cultural, and in the long run those rather than, shall

we say, industry and manufacturing as such are perhaps our greatest reason for being.

We have all these things in common, and so what we have been doing and thinking in New York may not be so irrelevant as it might at first seem. Of course, the problems in New York are on a larger scale. New York has for some three-quarters of a century at least, if not longer, been a great center of world trade; civilization has until now been concentrated on the Atlantic's shores and New York was one of the centers of that culture and trade. I do not know whether it will continue to be.

I do not know whether the present movement toward autarchy, self-contained nationalism, or perhaps even self-contained hemispheres, may make of New York a city on the periphery of a continent (as the Planning Commission has said in a formal report) rather than at a center of world culture, but I think it may be possible. San Francisco has been at one of the centers of Pacific culture. It may also be true that San Francisco will find itself on the periphery of a continent rather than at the center of a culture. I think no one can say as to that. So far as we both are concerned what we can do is to develop what we surely have got—that is, large management, finance, education, all that kind of thing; we shall do well to do the best we can with these.

About six or seven years ago New York had one of its recurrent reform movements and one of the particular incidents which was most spectacular in this reform movement was the choosing of a reformer to head the city government, Mayor Fiorello H. La Guardia. When he came into office, he, along with other people in the city, like Mr. Frederic Delano, who sits on my right here, began to appreciate that something must be done other than merely to think about reform. It would be possible, they felt, to make a distinct advance by rewriting the charter of the city, and so they undertook that. After considerable expert work, after long hearings, and after a great many draftings and compromises, the city put into effect, two years ago last January 1, its new basic law. My particular interest is that this charter included, not for the first time in New York but for the first time realistically, an agency for planning in the city.

There was nothing particularly novel about setting up a planning agency. A great many cities have them. I think, however, that there is something novel about the way it was done in New York. You know that planners, city planners, have certain instruments which they have been using for a great many years. Among them is one called a master plan—an idea of the future of the city, an idealization, if you like, of what the city may become. The master plan is not merely something which can be put on a map; nor is it something which can be put in files; it exists at least partly in the minds of people who love their city and who have worked for it; it is an idea of what that city's possibilities are for the future. But more practically this master plan is of use as a bench mark, a criterion, by which current projects—that is things which are from day

to day proposed and which may actually be undertaken—can be measured. The master plan sees to it, if it is a good one, that everything is fitted together and given its place; that there are, for instance, not too many schools provided but just enough; that there are adequate sewers, but that the sewer department is checked in an attempt to overbuild; that there is a water supply which looks forward to supplying any possible manufacturing development there may be, as well as all the family uses there may be, but not twice that amount, and so on. The master plan is, in other words, an adequately scaled visualization of what the city might be in the future.

There was nothing new about this when New York's charter was being prepared. Books had been written about master plans. So the charter makers were not doing anything new when they adopted this idea and put it in the custody of a commission—a planning commission. There was nothing new about their determination that any new project from one of the borough presidents, from the park department, or from the education department, for instance, should be referred to the planning commission who would have made a master plan and would then be able to compare the two, informing the board of estimate whether or not the project should be gone forward with at the particular moment. It was when they got to this point that the charter makers evidently began to think: "Well, there is more to this master plan than simply laying things out on a map and scaling them so that they fit together. There is something else here." And they cast about for what it was; and arrived at the conclusion that what they were feeling for was not only spatial relationships but also time relationships.

The charter makers had seen that it was important to say not only whether a new school, a new opera house, or a new health center fitted into the master plan but whether it was the opportune thing to do at the particular time. And at that point, again, they arrived at another conclusion, which was that it might be just as well, if they were thinking about time and the relation of things to each other, to think about whether it was possible to do it at all—financially, I mean. The result of all this cogitation was that they put another well-known instrument into the hands of the planning commission. This is called, in our charter, a capital budget. It might have been called an improvement budget or any one of a number of other technical names which accountants use; but what the term meant was that it was the duty of the planning commission not only to make a master plan, but also a capital budget and program which looked forward over a number of years, and put things not only in physical relation but also in time relation with each other. For instance, there should be a school at the corner of certain streets in accordance with the master plan, but it should be built in the year 1944 or 1946, not only because by that time the child population would have grown to the point where a school would be needed, but also because the city would have arrived at a point where the school could be paid for.

There are great difficulties in creating both a master plan and a capital budget which will occur to you at once. There are a great many uncertainties which not even the wisest planning commission, or even anyone else, can eliminate. No one could have foreseen, in 1925, that New York City would be able to finance many millions of dollars worth of public improvements (more than was expected) because about half of them would be paid for by the federal government, thus advancing the capital program about twice as fast as could otherwise have been done. And nobody would have been wise enough to have said that because of depression or war there might be a drop in real estate values which would so cut tax income that it would be difficult to go on with a program once laid out. These are things which in the kind of world we live in we cannot always foresee. That does not excuse us from doing the best we can. And it does not detract from the essential value of budgeting: A gain of 25 per cent in certainty is of advantage even if it cannot be said to be perfection.

In the master plan, in New York, we lay out what is an ideal visualization of the city; and in the capital budget we lay out what looks at that time like a fiscal program which can be met. Now, it may be that it cannot be met; but every year it is revised for six years in advance, not only for the current year coming, but for six years in advance. In a changeable and unstable world our budget comes, I think, as close as we are able at present to achieving stability.

There are other instruments, not so essential perhaps as those I have named, which planners customarily use, but still important. There is, for instance, one which is older than either of these as a formal planning instrument. It is usually called zoning; what it means is that somebody in authority in the city lays out regions within which certain kinds of developments will and will not be permitted, and sets certain standards for them. There have been in the past many arguments advanced for zoning—among them that it tends to stabilize neighborhoods, that it enables people to look forward to establishing themselves, either in a business or a home, in a neighborhood which will remain for some time to come the same as it was when it was chosen. There is also the fiscal argument that zoning levels out realty values; and, from the city's point of view, that it tends to maintain taxable income. There is, of course, the argument against zoning, that those people who administer it in many cities are the ones who are able to benefit themselves, rather than the city at large. That, of course, is very easy to do. If those people who have realty interests are allowed to manage the zoning of the city they can create for themselves great advantages. This reenforces what I have said about the need for decency in government. Because zoning can be and is abused, it does not follow that it is never good. When the charter in New York was being written, zoning was an old device there—in fact, New York had the first real comprehensive zoning ordinance in the

United States. But the city was by that time suffering from having been first in the field. There were other ordinances which were more modern and more comprehensive. However, such as it was, the people who wrote the charter put zoning, along with the master plan and capital budget, into the hands of the planning commission.

One other instrument, too, they gave the commission—the custody of the city map. That is a highly technical affair and doesn't sound very important at first, but when it is considered that anybody who wants to do almost anything in a city of a comprehensive sort has to come to the city authorities to get some kind of change in the map, then it will be realized that the agency which has custody of it is in a very good position to bargain with the person who wants a favor. If a developer, for instance, wants to move a sewer, if he wants a new street, or if he wants to eliminate an old one, or if he wants to do any one of a dozen things which developers do want, whether it is for an industry or for a housing development, he has to come for map changes to the body which has within its possession this visualization of the future which I call the master plan, and within its control the capital budget. The Commission then is in a position to bring to bear its determination of what ought to be done in the particular district which it is proposed to develop. This control is a powerful weapon.

The only novelty about what was done in New York was in putting all these instruments together and working out for the first time the actual physical possibilities of the city in terms of a financial program. Anyone who knows contemporary city government will recognize this as of the greatest significance, for practically all cities in the United States have reached the limit of their power to make expenditures for new improvements. It is almost impossible to go any further in most cities, and, certainly, that is true in New York. In New York we have got in the future to use the greatest economy, the greatest foresight, in order to give people the facilities which more and more they are demanding of the city. People are no longer satisfied with dirty streets, with an impure water supply, with health centers which are inadequate, with schools which don't educate. City government in the United States may be on the verge of a renaissance in all these matters, and I think that an adequate and competent planning body, given the powers that were given to the planning body in New York, can be of the greatest assistance, especially in setting up proper relations and in working out a financial program. I don't think it can be a substitute for any other part of government. I am sure it can't. For instance I know it couldn't have been done in New York without Mayor La Guardia's support. But given such support it is worth much more than it costs any city.

When I spoke of the common characteristics of our two cities, I mentioned one factor which I went over rather quickly. That is, that our two cities are decaying at the center and growing at the peripheries; but I

want to tell you, as I don't need to tell anybody who knows city planning in a technical way, that that is true of practically every city in the United States. What the remedy for it is I don't know—or, rather, I know that it must be very drastic. For a group of downtown merchants, I can assure you, it is a matter of life or death, just as it is for the central merchants in New York City who have just come to realize that fact in the past year or two.

The problem really arises because of a change which none of us can do anything about. Our cities have, to put it bluntly, almost stopped growing. Census figures show very clearly that in most of the cities of the United States at least the central portions of the city have altogether stopped growing. What growth there is, is confined to the peripheral area, that is the suburbs, most of which are outside the city limits. This fact would not be important if population were growing as fast as it did in the decades from 1900 to 1920, but that is no longer so. What happens now if a family moves from the center of the city to one of the suburbs is that there is a family gone without replacement; there is a vacant piece of land, which is by that much reduced in value, and that means almost completely. This is responsible not only for the fiscal condition of our cities to a great extent, but also for their appearance. They are shoddy, rotten, and run down, and this is true not only of New York, but of almost all cities in the country. It is argued by eminent authorities that this process must go on; that the only way to rebuild the centers of our cities is to ruin all the people who own land in the center of the cities, to carry on this process until they give it up almost voluntarily. Of course it is true that this is exactly what is happening. Perhaps that is what we want to happen; but I think we ought to know what we're doing.

It may be that real estate speculators on the outskirts of the cities ought to be allowed to ruin all the landlords and all the real estate speculators in the center of the cities. I don't know. But that is not a planned way to approach the situation, and, from the point of view of a city official, I can assure you that it ruins the city while it ruins the landlords. When a family moves out from New York to the suburbs the family is not there any longer to be taxed and the merchants from whom that family used to buy are no longer there to be taxed. They are buying somewhere else. There must be a better way to do it. We have thought of a number of ways in New York, though none of them has yet come to fruition.

We may as well be frank: Our cities are ugly and inhospitable. They are growing more so. Believe me, when people move away they don't take it lightly. People don't move out from New York City to Westchester County, nor, I assume, from the center of San Francisco, we'll say, to Palo Alto, simply for the sake of moving. Mothers move because they can have a place for their children to play, because the schools out there are newer; because there is no adequate zoning within the city which would control the kinds of abuses which families will not live along side

of. These things have got to be corrected if we are to keep our cities solvent, and keep them functioning as decent places in which to live and work.

Perhaps I have borne down on this particular problem a little hard, and yet I have come to feel, as I have studied my own city, that it is almost the first problem we must learn to solve in New York—how to assemble and rehabilitate properties within the center of the city; how, if you like, to create suburbs within the city instead of outside, because there is not going to be in the future a growth of population which will be sufficient to populate the suburbs and the centers of the cities too. In the future either we are going to have to bring the population back from the suburbs or we are going to have to allow the city itself to be ruined.

I said when I began that these problems, in the kind of world we read about in the papers every day, must seem to all of us to be, however important individually, somewhat trivial, and yet, I believe, it is in this kind of thing that our democracies, to give them a name which I think they don't altogether deserve, are most faulty. We have not learned any better way to improve our cities than to let one set of business men ruin another set. I am sure that there is a better way to do it. An adequate planning body, firmly set in the city's government, can contribute a great deal toward the solution.

Resolutions of the Thirty-Second National Conference on Planning

I.

Thomas Adams, famous British planning expert, and known to all American planners for his work on the New York Regional Plan and for his important books on planning, died in England this spring. A pioneer in regional planning and in subdivision design, Thomas Adams spent many years in this country and had a profound influence in the development of planning here. His tremendous energy, vitality and sincerity set a splendid example to all American planners, one which they will always find difficult to emulate.

Thomas Adams served as secretary of the First Garden City Association. In 1909 he was appointed to be the first town planning inspector of the British Local Government Board. In 1914 he went to Canada as town planning adviser to the Canadian government, where he remained until 1921. He was chosen in 1923 to direct the Regional Plan of New York and Its Environs, work which he continued to direct until 1930.

Mr. Adams served as professor of city planning at Harvard University and lectured at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He was the author of a number of reports, articles and books, among which are *An Outline of Town and City Planning* and *Recent Advances in City Planning*.

Thomas Adams had many friends in the United States and his loss will be felt keenly.

Be it resolved, therefore, that the National Conference on Planning hereby expresses sincerest regrets on the passing of Thomas Adams to Mrs. Adams, to Professor Frederick J. Adams of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and assures them that the work of Thomas Adams will remain a guide and inspiration to planners in this country.

II.

Sir Raymond Unwin is gone. Unquestionably one of the leading planners of all times, he had as his one aim the improvement of man's environment; his influence has been felt not only in England but throughout the world.

Sir Raymond was a leader in the British garden city movement. His book *Town Planning in Practice*, published in 1910, had widespread circulation and is still a major source of planning philosophy. Among the many important positions he held during his long and useful life were the presidencies of the British Town Planning Institute, the Royal Institute of Architects, and the important Building Resource Station at Garston. For ten years after the war Sir Raymond was in charge of the housing program of the British Ministry of Health during England's most productive period in this public work. He was active in, and president of, the International Federation for Housing and Town Planning.

Sir Raymond was a close friend of the United States and made many visits here. He was intimately associated with our housing and planning movements. During the last four years he spent much of his time here as visiting professor at Columbia University. While traveling widely throughout the country he counseled with many housing and planning organizations and became intimately acquainted with leaders in these movements.

Sir Raymond was loved and admired not only by his intimates and associates but by all with whom he had contact. He was the ultimate in mildness, modesty and understanding, and his death is a personal loss felt by every member of the profession.

Be it resolved, therefore, that the National Conference on Planning hereby expresses to Lady Unwin and to Mrs. Curtice Hitchcock, her daughter, the sincere sympathy of the American planners, and states to them with assurance that the work which Sir Raymond Unwin influenced so greatly will be carried on.

III.

Whereas the Commission on Resources and Education, which has been formed by and is composed of representatives of the National Education Association, the Progressive Education Association and the United States Office of Education, recognizes the importance of planning as a function of democratic government and as a subject for study in the public schools, now, therefore,

Be it resolved that the National Conference on Planning endorses the work of the Commission on Resources and Education, and

Be it further resolved that this Conference urge its participating organizations formally to offer to the Commission on Resources and Education their full support and cooperation.

IV.

The incomparable charm of San Francisco and its gracious hospitality have provided a perfect setting for the stimulating sessions and significant discussions of the National Conference on Planning. To the Hon. Angelo J. Rossi, Mayor of the City of San Francisco, the Conference extends its felicitations and an earnest expression of its appreciation.

The Conference extends its thanks for the untiring work and the excellent results of this work in Conference arrangements to Mrs. Albert W. Stokes, President of the San Francisco City Planning Commission; to Dr. Baldwin M. Woods, General Chairman of the Conference; to Mark Jorgensen, Chairman of the Local Arrangements Committee; to V. B. Stanbery, Counselor for Region No. 8 of the National Resources Planning Board; to the committee members who worked with them, to the chairman and members of the Steering Committee, the Regional Coordinating Committee, the Ladies Committee, the Hostess Committee, the Hospitality Committee, the Entertainment Committee and the Transportation Committee.

The Conference expresses sincere appreciation to the California Planners' Institute for the unusually fine planning exhibit at the Conference arranged through the Exhibit Committee under the chairmanship of Ronald Campbell, to the press for its excellent reporting of the Conference, and to the numerous other groups and individuals who, in the spirit of western hospitality and civic enterprise, have contributed greatly to the success of the Conference.

American Society of Planning Officials

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS, 1940-1941

HAROLD S. OSBORNE, *President*

Chairman, Town Planning Board, Montclair, New Jersey.

BALDWIN M. WOODS, *Vice-President*

Chairman, Region No. 8, National Resources Planning Board, Berkeley, California.

FREDERIC A. DELANO, *Honorary Vice-President*

Chairman, National Resources Planning Board.

FREDERICK BIGGER, Chairman, Pittsburgh City Planning Commission.

HAROLD S. BUTTENHEIM, Past President, American Society of Planning Officials; Chairman, Zoning Board of Adjustment, Madison, New Jersey; Editor, The American City Magazine, New York City.

CARROLL F. GRAFF, President, Duluth City Planning Commission.

B. H. KIZER, Past President, American Society of Planning Officials; Chairman, Washington State Planning Council; Member, Pacific Northwest Regional Planning Commission; Chairman, Region No. 9, National Resources Planning Board; Chairman, Spokane City Planning Commission, Spokane, Washington.

JAMES M. LANGLEY, Member, New Hampshire State Planning and Development Commission and Concord City Planning Board; Editor, The Concord Monitor.

EARL O. MILLS, Planning Counselor, Region No. 5, National Resources Planning Board, St. Louis, Missouri.

JAMES P. POPE, Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

REXFORD G. TUGWELL, Chairman, City Planning Commission, New York City.

GEORGE F. YANTIS, Member, National Resources Planning Board.

WALTER H. BLUCHER, *Executive Director*

Former City Planner and Secretary of the Detroit City Plan Commission. Former member, Detroit City Housing Commission; Planning Consultant, National Resources Committee; President, Michigan Planning Conference; Consultant to Housing Division, P.W.A.

PAUL OPPERMAN, *Assistant Director*

CHARLES S. ASCHER, *Treasurer*

Secretary, Committee on Public Administration of the Social Science Research Council; former Secretary, Public Administration Clearing House; former Executive Director, National Association of Housing Officials.

Index

- Agriculture
 - Mechanization of, 33-4, 39-41
 - Migratory farm labor, 32
- Airport zoning, 83-4
- Alworth, William E., 110-14
- Architectural control, 78-9, 125-32
 - Boards of review, 126, 128
- Atkins, Richard A., 151
- Augur, Tracy B., 157-67
- Aumack, Harry F., 42
- Bard, Albert S., 129-31
- Bauer, Catherine, 22, 165, 166
- Bennett, Charles B., 142-43
- Bessey, Roy F., 36-8, 105-06
- Bettman, Alfred, 121-22, 165
- Bigger, Frederick, 10-23
- Black, Russell V., 23, 129, 131
- Blight
 - And zoning, 81-2
 - Along highways, 131
 - In central business districts, 107-14, 187-88
- Buttenheim, Harold S., 23, 133-56
- Campbell, Ronald, 24, 27
- Central business districts, 107-14, 186-88
 - Los Angeles, 111
 - New York, 113-14, 186-88
 - Portland, Oregon, 112-13
 - Rehabilitation of, 108-10
- Cheney, Charles H., 125-29
- Citizen advisory planning boards, 11-9, 22, 23, 86, 124
 - California, 24
 - Functions of, 12, 13, 14
 - Necessity for, 11
 - Personnel of, 12-3, 26
 - Pittsburgh, 15-9
 - Program of, 13-4
- City planning
 - And private enterprise, 158-60, 165
 - And public responsibility, 160-65
 - New York, 182-88
 - Pittsburgh, 15-9
 - San Francisco, 126
- Coil, E. J., 102-03
- Columbia Basin Project, 41, 97-8, 105-06
- Commission on Resources and Education, 20-1
- Coons, Arthur G., 8
- County planning
 - California, 24-7
 - Highways, 121-24, 131
 - Washington, 86, 87
- Crane, Jacob, 166
- Crow, H. G., 143-46
- Curran, Charles L., 149
- Deewall, Lorin W., 27
- Defense planning, 1-3, 6, 7, 8, 36-8, 98-101
 - Education and, 20-1
 - Effect on migration problem, 36-8
 - Regional industrial trends and, 98-101
 - Relation to long-range planning, 3, 36
- Democracy, 168-72
 - And planning, 1-3, 5-7, 8, 173-81
 - Assumptions of, 169
 - Confusions in, 170-71
 - History of democratic planning, 173-77
- Downs, Myron D., 85, 86, 166-67
- Draper, Earle S., 180
- Duffy, Walter A., 36, 38-40
- Education for planning, 10-23
 - And housing, 22
 - Citizen advisory boards, 11-19, 22, 23, 86, 124
 - Commission on Resources and Education, 20-1
 - Cooperation of teachers and planners, 20-1
 - Objectives of, 10
 - Pittsburgh Regional Planning Association, 15-9
 - Texts, 22, 23
- Eliot, Charles W., 1-9
- Elwood, Philip H., 20, 21, 22
- Evans, Frank O., 110-11
- Feiss, Carl, 20-3
- FHA, 127
- Fisch, Fred W., 66-67
- Fox, William J., 24-5, 27, 66-9
- Franklin, Dr. Walter Scott, 26
- Freeman, Harry D., 36-41, 110, 111-13
- Friedman, H. J., 129, 131-32
- Fugard, John R., 107-14
- Green, Mary Jane, 23
- Grimm, Sergei N., 148
- Gross, George, 20, 22
- Hall, Howard M., 141-42
- Hanna, Paul, 20, 22, 23
- Hare, S. Herbert, 110, 113, 156
- Haydock, Winters, 165, 166
- Hedges, T. S., 135
- Henry, L. A., 138-39
- Hetherton, P., 85, 86, 105

- Hewes, L. I., 66, 67-8
- Highway planning, 42-69, 115-32
 Application of traffic engineering, 50-2
 ASPO committee report, 42-66
 Bureau of Public Roads Report, 43-5
 Comprehensive, long-term planning and, 45-8, 66-9
 Past highway policies, 42-3, 115-18
 Proposed state action on, 123-24
 Rapid Transit, 52-6
 Responsibility for, 62-5
 Toll Roads, 43-5
 See Roadside Control
- Horwitz, Aaron B., 87, 139, 154-56
- Housing
 FHA, 127-28
 Relation to city planning, 22, 23, 78, 79, 157-67
 USHA, 166
- Howard, John T., 85-7, 146-48
- Industrial location trends
 Differences in basic costs, 94-6
 Domestic trade barriers, 93
 Miscellaneous factors in, 96-7, 102-3
 Planning, 102
 State competition, 92-3
- Industrial trends, regional, 89-106
 Effect of national defense on, 98-101
 In the Northwest, 97-8, 105
 In the South, 103-05
 Number of manufacturing wage-earners, 90-1
 Processes in, 91-2
- James, Chester A., 25, 27
- James, Harlean, 9, 115-24, 129-32
- Kittredge, Frank A., 7, 9
- Kizer, Benjamin H., 9, 133-35
- Klaber, Eugene H., 165
- Knapp, Fred W., 154, 155
- Land-use density
 Effect of zoning, 80-1
- Landauer, Carl, 7-8
- Lautner, Harold W., 7-9
- Lock, Clarence W., 143
- Loeffler, H. C., 151
- McCrary, Irvin J., 85-8
- McKee, Frank, 26, 27
- McWilliams, Carey, 28-41
- Maitland, Walter McC., 154, 155
- Marr, John G., 165-67
- Marsh, Burton W., 42
- Mason, Rupert, 156
- May, Samuel C., 7, 8
- Merriam, Charles E., 168-81
- Mickle, D. Grant, 42
- Migration and resettlement, 28-41
 Attitude toward in California, 31-3
- Bureau of Reclamation and, 33, 40-1
 Effect on school population in Los Angeles, 111
 Farm Security Administration and, 33, 36-7, 39
 Migrant communities, 28-31
 Pacific Northwest study, 37-8
 Types of approach to, 33-6
- Miller, Willis H., 154-56
- National planning, 1-7, 7-9, 36-8, 98-101, 173-81
 National Resources Planning Board, 3-4, 7, 176
- Nelson, Herbert U., 114
- Nolen, John, Jr., 88
- Orton, Lawrence M., 110, 113-14
- Osborne, Harold S., 23, 155-56
- Pacific Northwest Regional Planning Commission
 Study of land and migration problems, 37-8
- Pettingill, Robert B., 8
- Penfield, Wallace C., 87, 88
- Pittsburgh Regional Planning Association, 15-9
- Planning
 And Democracy, 173-80
 Definition of, 173-79
 Education for, 10-9
 History of, 173-75
 Objectives of, 10
- Planning boards
 Citizen members, 11-2, 22
 Relation to highway and transportation planning, 62-6
 Statistics on, 4
- Pomeroy, Hugh R., 8, 70-88, 150-51
- Population
 Characteristics of migratory, 28
 Indices of regional industrial development, 100, 101
 Los Angeles school, 111
 Rural to urban, 109
- Rapid transit, 52-6
- Raver, Paul J., 89-106
- Regional planning
 Columbia Basin, 97-8, 105
 Migrant resettlement, 28-41
 TVA, 92
- Resolutions, 189-90
- Resources
 Definition of, 5-6
 Planning of, 1-9
- Rettie, James C., 180-81
- Reynolds, Mrs. Ralph A., 129, 132
- Rick, Glenn A., 129-32
- Riley, R. E., 135-37

- Roadside control
 - Access and use of abutting property, 56-60, 78, 118-24
 - Parkways, 119-20
 - Right-of-way, 60-2, 82-3, 131-32
 - Strip zoning, 119-23, 129-30
- Russell, Herbert L., 66, 68-9
- Sampson, Kenneth, 102-6
- Segoe, Ladislav, 42
- Shattuck, I. S., 42
- Show, S. B., 7, 9
- Simons, George W., Jr., 154, 155
- Smith, Edgar C., 26, 27
- Stearns, Frank F., 85, 87
- Swan, Herbert S., 102, 103-05
- Tax-abandoned land, disposal of, 133-56
- Taylor, Eugene, 22
- Tellefsen, M., 167
- Tilton, L. Deming, 9, 137-38
- Traffic Surveys, 50-2
- Transportation, 42-69, 72-3
 - ASPO committee report, 42-66
 - Integration of facilities, 45-7
 - Local control of, 62-5
 - Relation to master plan, 47-50, 67
- Tugwell, Rexford G., 180-81, 182-88
- Tyler, R. G., 66, 69
- USHA, 166
- Vogel, Joshua H., 85, 87, 167
- Warne, William E., 36, 40-1
- Warner, Kenneth O., 20, 22
- Weber, Charles M., 165, 166
- Werba, Arthur M., 142-3
- Xanthaky, George, 148, 149
- Yantis, George, 22
- Zoning, 70-88, 119-24, 128, 129-30
 - Airport, 83-4
 - Architectural control, 78-9
 - Blight, 81-2
 - Court decisions on, 71-2
 - County, 75-6, 78, 86, 87, 123
 - California, 26
 - Washington, 86, 87
 - Density control, 80-1
 - Elimination of non-conforming uses, 79
 - Flood Plain, 79-80
 - Growth of, 74-6
 - History of, 72-4
 - Master plan and, 77-8, 81, 82, 86-7, 88
 - Need for, 70-4
 - Planned rights-of-way, 82-3
 - Public opinion and, 88
 - Off-street parking, 79
 - Retail business district classification, 79
 - Roadside control, 78
 - Shortcomings of, 76-7
 - Statistics, 75-6
 - Strip, 119-23, 129-30
 - Subdivision control, 84-5
 - Urban, 74
 - Watershed, 80

